

27

THE
Resurrection
OF
The (same) Body
ASSERTED:

FROM
The Traditions of the *Heathens*, the *Ancient Jews*, and the *Primitive Church*.
WITH
An ANSWER to the OBJECTIONS
brought against it.

By HUMPHRY HODGKIN, D. D.
Fellow of *Wadham College* in *Oxford*, and
Chaplain to His Grace JOHN Lord
Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*.

Non enim levia sunt illa de quibus contendimus, sed ejusmodi ut & illa scire præstantius sit, & ignorare turpissimum. Sæ. Methodius de Resurrectione.

L O N D O N,
Printed for *Awnsham and John Churchill*, at
the *Black-Swan* in *Water-Noster-Row*, 1694.

LIBRARY OF THE
UNION
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

Advertisement

The (Grand) Bazaar

will be held

on the 1st

of the month of January

at the

City of London

at the

City of London

at the

City of London

at the

City of London

at the

City of London

at the

City of London

at the

REVERENDO ADMODUM

IN CHRISTO

PATRI

AC PRÆSULI

Edvardo Stillingfleet,

Grandi Nomini,

HISTORIAM HANC

Resurrectionis Corporis,

Sacellanus nuper, semper Cultor

Ejus Devotissimus,

HUMFREDUS HODY,

D. D. C.

A 2

THE

TO THE
READER.

THis Treatise contains a History of the Resurrection of the Body: The Grand Design of it is to prove the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the same Humane Body to be the Doctrine of the Gospel. If that be prov'd, the Truth of it is sufficiently demonstrated; and that is all the Author desires should be granted him. What he lays down concerning the Heathens and Jews, and that which he advances concerning the Resurrection, its being once a General Doctrine deriv'd down from Noah and the Ante-diluvian Patriarchs, all that is ex abundanti, and design'd only for the more Curious. There is one thing more which he had me say, and that is this, That he treads not in any Man's Steps; but the Entertainment which he has here prepared for thee, is wholly, and in all its Parts, new, at least his own.

May 26.
1694.

THE

THE CONTENTS.

PART I.

Concerning the Opinions of the Heathens: That they held many Opinions which were grounded on a Tradition concerning the Resurrection; and that some of them hold the Resurrection in the true Christian Sense.

THeir gross Notions concerning the Soul in its State of separation, that it has all the same Parts that the Body has, p. 3. A Mistake of St. Justin Martyr, p. 4.

Their Opinion concerning the Transmigration of Souls, p. 6.

Their Opinion concerning the duration of the Soul as long as the Body lasted, and its adherence to the Body after Death, p. 11.

They believe that some Men have ascended up into Heaven in their Bodies, there to live for ever, p. 13.

That others have done so even after Death upon a Re-union of their Souls and Bodies, p. 15.

The Opinion of the Pythagoreans and Platonists, &c. concerning the Restitution of our Bodies, and of all other things in the World, to their former State, after the revolution of many Ages, by a new Birth or production, p. 16.

The CONTENTS

The Opinion of some of the Genethliacal Writers, that the Soul returns, and is united to the same Body in the space of 440 Years, p. 20.

The Opinion of the Stoicks concerning the reproduction of all the same Men, &c. after the general Conflagration, p. 20.

That Democritus asserted the Resurrection: Epicurus's Opinion concerning the restoration of the very same Bodies after a great space of time, p. 26. Merick Casaubon's Mistake concerning the Opinion of the Emperor M. Antoninus, p. 23.

The Resurrection asserted in the same sense as we understand it, by the ancient Magi, and by the present Heathen Gaur's of Persia, the Relicks of the ancient Magi, p. 29. By some of the ancient Arabians, p. 31. By some of the Banians of India, p. 33. By the present Inhabitants of the Island of Ceylon, p. 36. Of Java, p. 37. Of Pegu, p. 37. Of Transiana, p. 37. By some amongst the Chinese, p. 37. By the Arderians in Guinee, p. 45. And by the ancient Prussians, p. 45.

These Traditions concerning the Resurrection, not receiv'd from the Jews, but transmitted down from Noah and the Ante-diluvian Patriarchs, p. 49.

PART II,

Concerning the Opinions of the ancient Jews, p. 53. to 107.

THE Doctrine of the Resurrection no Article of Faith, or Term of Communion amongst them 'till about 100 Years after Christ, p. 53. &c.
Nor

The CONTENTS.

Not own'd by the Essens, p. 54. nor by Philo, p. 56. yet the common and general Doctrine long before that time, p. 64. Their not making it a Term of Communion, no Argument against the certainty of it. The Soul's Immortality its self no Term of the Jewish Communion in those times. The Sadduces own'd as true Jews, p. 89. The Opinion of Josephus, p. 66. Of the Sapientes Mecar, p. 60. the Hemero-Baptists, p. 61. and the Samaritans, p. 62. They that held the Resurrection understood it to be of the same Humane Body. The Opinion of some of the Jews concerning the passing of their Bodies under-ground to the Holy Land, and their Custom of carrying the Bones of their Dead thither, p. 70.

The Transmigration of Souls held by many of the Jews, p. 78. and by some of the Pharisees in the time of Josephus, p. 81. Whether held by any in our Saviour's time? p. 82. They that own the Transmigration, acknowledge withal a Resurrection, p. 87.

Testimonies for the Resurrection out of the Old Testament, p. 96.

PART III.

Concerning the Doctrine of the Primitive Church.

THE Resurrection of the same Humane Body demonstrated from the New Testament, p. 107, &c. and from the Doctrine of the Primitive Writers, which flourish'd before the time of Origen, such as St. Clement of Rome, p. 133. Justin M., p. 141. Irenæus, p. 142. Athe-

The CONTENTS.

Athenagoras, p. 143. Theophilus of Antioch, p. 144. *The Churches of Lions and Vienna*, p. 144. Clemens Alex. p. 145. Tertullian, p. 145. and others: *And from the Creeds of the Primitive Church, and others in several Ages*, p. 171. *The Inconsistencies and Contradictions of Origen*, p. 108, 109, 152, to 168. *That he himself in some places of his Works own'd the Resurrection of the same Humane Body*, p. 152. *That the Primitive Fathers would never have embraced the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the same humane Body, if it had not been evidently Apostolical*, 180.

PART IV.

Objections answer'd: *The Qualities of the Body in the Resurrection. The Reason why it is to rise*, p. 184, &c.

The principal *Errata* are these.

PAGE 9. Line 17. for *their Souls* read *the Soul*. p. 23. l. 22. r. *Merick*, p. 30. l. 12. r. *Tears*, which. Ibid 109. r. *Guebres*. p. 53. l. 8. r. *of the number*. p. 58. l. 25. r. *will free*. p. 59. l. 9. r. *dissolution*. p. 93. l. 12. for *Rights* r. *Rites*. p. 100. l. 9. r. *unwilling*. Ibid l. 15. r. *do not contain*. p. 109. l. 1. r. *represent*. p. 171. l. 24. r. *as also from St. Austin*.

*The Resurrection of the (same)
Body asserted.*

THE *Resurrection* is defin'd by *Maimonides* to be *The return of the Soul into the same Body from which it had been separated*; and agreeable to this Definition, the Catholick Faith, spread throughout the whole Christian World, is this, That *the same Body which died, consisting of the same Particles, shall rise again out of its Grave in the Day of Judgment, and be re-united to the Soul.* But *Origen* heretofore, as you rightly observe, (my dear *Philalethes*) and some other late Opinionists, have been pleased to advance another Notion, That *the Body to which the Soul shall be united in the next Life, shall not be a Human Body, but a thin and Ethereal one, and that too consisting of new Particles.*

In asserting the truth of the Catholick Doctrine (the Task you are pleased to impose on me) I shall use all possible Plainness, and observe this Method.

B

I.

- I. I shall shew it to be *probable* from the Traditions even of the Heathens themselves, convey'd down to 'em from *Noah* and his Posterity.
- II. I shall *prove* it from the Authority of the Old Testament, and the Traditions of the Ancient *Jews*, and shew it from thence to be, if not *certain*, yet *more than probable*.
- III. I shall *demonstrate* it from the Authority of the New Testament, and the Unanimous consent of the Primitive Church before the time of *Origen*, and prove it from thence to be *certain*.
- IV. I shall answer the Objections rais'd against it.

To pretend to make out the *Probability* of the Doctrine of the Resurrection, from the Opinions and Traditions of the *Heathens*, may seem perhaps a very vain Attempt. But it is no more than what many of the Ancients have endeavour'd to do; and *Photius* mentions an Author, who published a large Work in *Fifteen* Books, to prove, That the Doctrine of the Resurrection, with other *Christian* Doctrines, was own'd by many of the *Gentiles*. The several Nations whose Opinions that Author produced, were, as *Photius* tells us, the *Greeks*, *Persians*, *Thracians*, *Egyptians*.

ans, Babylonians, Chaldeans, and Italians. What success either He, or any other Author that attempted the same, might meet with, I am not concern'd to enquire; but I think I shall be able to shew, that many of the Notions and Opinions of the *Heathens* were grounded on a Tradition concerning the *Resurrection*; nay, that many of the Heathens in Ancient Times acknowledged it, and that many of 'em do so to this Day. I shall first lay before you some Opinions embraced by the *Heathens*, which, I think, carry with them no small resemblance of the Doctrine of the *Resurrection*. And in the Second place shall present you with others which plainly express it.

The first Opinion which I shall take notice of, is concerning the *Human Shape* and Actions attributed to the Soul in its State of Separation. It was anciently the common and receiv'd Opinion of the *Gentiles*, and so it is at this time throughout the whole Heathen World, That the *Soul* (or *Manes* which remain after Death) has a perfect *Human Shape*, and all the same Parts, both External and Internal, that the *Body* has; and that when it leaves the *Body*, it *Eats* and *Drinks*, and does all the same things that a living Man does. Now from whence can we ima-

gine this odd Opinion should arise, and be so generally propagated all over the World? I shall leave it to be considered by you, whether it were not grounded on an Ancient Tradition, That the *Soul* after Death shall be united to a *Human Body*.

* *Cobart.
ad Grac.
p. 26.*

* *Justin Martyr*, to prove that the Doctrine of the Resurrection was known to *Homer*, produces his description of *Tityus's* Punishment after Death, and what he says of the Punishments of *Sisyphus* and *Tantalus*. Their Punishments, says he, suppose not a *Soul* only, but also a *Body*. The same sort of Argument he makes use of to prove, that *Plato* held the same Doctrine. He observes that *Plato* in the Story which he relates concerning *Eris*, speaks of those that were punished in Hell, as of *Men* compounded of *Body* and *Soul*, with the same Parts and Countenances which they had when living here on Earth; that he makes *Aridæus*, and other *Tyrants*, to be bound Neck and Heels, and to be Flea'd, and then to be drag'd through Thorns and Briars. Now, says he, for *Plato* to say, that the *Soul* is judged with the *Body*, can signify nothing else but that he believ'd the Doctrine of the Resurrection: For how could *Aridæus*, and the rest, be punished after that manner in Hell, if they

they had left their Bodies, their Heads, Hands, and Feet on Earth? Sure they will not say, that the Soul has a Head, a Skin, and Hands, and Feet. But this is a Mistake of that excellent Person. The Reason why the Heathens described the Punishments of the *Damn'd* after this manner, was not because they thought that their *Bodies* were not left here on Earth, but partly because it was the vulgar Opinion, that the *Soul* had all the same Parts that the *Body* has, and partly because such Descriptions do more easily move and affect us; and it is not easy to describe the Torments of the *Soul* after any other manner. Our *Lord*, in the Parable of *Dives* and *Lazarus*, speaks of them in the same manner, as if they had *Bodies*; tho' what is related of 'em is supposed to be before the *Resurrection*, and their *Bodies* are suppos'd to be yet in their Graves. I might mention others of the Ancient Christians that have made use of Arguments of the like nature; but it is not my Business to confute those who have written for the *Resurrection*; I shall therefore pass them by.

From what has been said concerning our Saviour's speaking of the Soul of *Lazarus*, as if it had a Body, tho' he did not believe it had; you may possibly

imagine that the Heathens did not really believe, that the Soul has all the Parts of a Human Body, though they are wont to speak of it, as if they believ'd it. But it evidently and undeniably appears, that that was, and is at this time, their real Opinion. Hence the Custom so general in the World of leaving *Meat* and *Drink* on the *Graves* of the *Dead*, and of burying together with the dead Bodies all sorts of *Utensils*, *Household-Stuff*, and *Weapons*, which they think the Soul will make use of in the next Life. Hence also the Custom in so many Countries, of putting to Death the *Wives* and *Slaves* of the deceased, that they may wait upon 'em, and serve in the same Capacities in the other World. For Brevity sake, I am content to seem a little Immodest, and to take it for granted, that you believe I can prove what I have asserted.

The *Second* Opinion, that deserves to be consider'd, is that of the μετεμψυχως, or *Transmigration* of *Souls* out of one Body into another. 'Twas (you know) the Opinion, not only of the *Pythagoreans*, and *Platonists*, and some of the *Stoicks*, amongst the *Greeks*, but of many whole Nations of the ancient *Gentiles*; and 'tis still the received Opinion of

of the greatest part of the *Eastern* Heathens, and of many other Countries in divers parts of the World, that when a Man dies, his *Soul* passes into another Body, either the Body of a Man, or of some other Creature. Now, on what could this Opinion be grounded, but on some broken and imperfect Tradition, concerning the *Resurrection* of our Bodies? How came so strange an Opinion to obtain in so many Countries? They had doubtless heard from their Ancestors, the Descendants of *Noah*, that after Death, the *Soul* should be reunited to a *Body*; and not knowing, by reason of the imperfectness of the Tradition, how it was to be done, they invented a way for it, and imagin'd it was to be by a *παλιγγενεσία*, or by being *born again*. And as *Error* is always fruitful in Inventions, and, one having taken Root, there is presently a *Superfætation* of many others, they afterwards carried it on farther, and fancy'd a *Transmigration* of the *Soul*, not only into another *Human* Body, but also into the Bodies of other living Creatures, and even into *Trees* and *Plants*. But the *Transmigration* of the *Soul* into the Bodies of *irrational Animals* was never so generally receiv'd as its *Transmigration* into another *Human*

man Body. The Author of the Book *De Spermate*, ascribed to Galen, tells us, that the Philosopher Porphyry maintain'd That the Soul of a Beast passes into a Beast, but the Soul of a Man, into a Man. And

* De Fro-
vid. &
Fato ap.
Phot. Cod.
CCXIV.

* Hierocles affirms, that the Soul of a Man passes only into a Man. Of the same Opinion was *Timæus Locrus*, with divers others of the *Pythagoreans*: And the same was likewise the Opinion of the ancient *Gauls*, as may be gather'd

a Bel. Gal.
l. 6. c. 14.

from what *Cæsar* says of 'em. *Impri-
mis* (say he) *hoc volunt persuadere: non
interire animas, sed ab aliis post mortem
transire ad alios; atque hoc maxime ad
virtutem excitari putant, metu mortis neg-*

b Bel. Cel-
tico.

lecto. Appian^b writes of the ancient
Germans, that they contemn'd Death
δι' ἐλπίδα ἀναβιώσεως, through the hopes
they had of reviving or living again. Which
I understand, not immediately of the Re-
surrection, but of the Transmigration of
the Soul into another *Human Body*.
And in the same Sence I understand *Lu-
can*, where he speaks of the Opinion of
the *Scythians*.

—— *Populus quos despicit Arctos,
Felices errore suo, quos ille timorum
Maximus haud urget lethi metus, inde ruendi
In ferrum mens prona viris, animiq; capaces
Mortis & ignavum reditura parcere vitæ.*

That

That the Opinion of the *Transmigration* was grounded on a Tradition concerning the *Resurrection*, will appear more Probable, if we consider what * *Herodotus* writes of the Doctrine of the *Egyptians* : That the Soul being departed this Body, after many *Removes* into the Bodies of all kinds of Animals, and after a long Time, *viz.* 3500 Years, assumes again the Body of a Man. And to this Day, there are great Numbers in *Grand Caire*, and some in other parts of the World, that assert very near the same thing, and agree with those ancient *Egyptians* almost exactly in the Number of Years. They will tell ye, that their Souls having passed into several Beasts, of the same Kind, and wander'd out of the Body of one to animate another, it will at last, after the Circle of † 3365 Years, return again to a *Human* Body, more purified, and refin'd than in its first Principles. What is this but a broken Tradition concerning the Re-union of our Souls with our Bodies at the end of the World ?

But others of the Ancients come up yet more close to us : They tell us that the Souls of those that are in *Heaven* or *Elysium*, continue there a long time, a *Thousand* Years, or the like, and then shall

* l. 2.

c. 123.

† Sir Paul
Ricaut of
the Turkish
Empire,

l. 2. c. 12.

p. 183.

shall come again into the World, and be united to a *Human* Body. Thus

* *Æn.* 6. * *Virgil* from the Traditions of the Ancients.

*Quisque suos patimur manes : Exinde per amplum
Mittimur Elysiū, & pauci leta arva tenemus,
Donec longa dies perfectō temporis Orbe
Concretam exemit labem, purūque reliquit
Ætherium sensum, atque aurai simplicis ignem.
Has omnes, ubi mille rotam volvere per annos,
Lethæum ad fluvium Deus evocat agmine magno :
Scilicet inmemores supera ut convexa revisant,
Rursus & incipiant in corpora velle reverti.*

Claudian. 2. *Ruff.*

*Quos ubi per varios annos, per mille figuras
Egit Lethæo purgatos flumine, tandem
Rursus ad humanæ revocat primordia formæ.*

† *De tem-
pore, Serm.*
139 &
142.

St. Austin † mentions this as the Opinion of the greatest Philosophers. That the Souls (says he) of bad Men pass immediately into other Bodies; and that the Souls of good Men are a long time in Rest, but after a great while come down from Heaven, and assume Bodies again, *Hoc dixerunt valde magni Philosophi.*

I shall

I shall add no more concerning these Opinions, but only put you in mind, that ^a *Tertullian*, ^b *Minucius Felix*, and ^c *De Resur.* *Laëtantius*, no less Men than they, were of my Opinion, That the Doctrine of the *Transmigration* was founded on a Tradition concerning the *Resurrection*.

c. 1.
Sed Platonici immortalem animam & contrario reclamant:

immo adhuc proxime etiam in Corpora remeabilem affirmant; etsi non in eadem, etsi non in humana tantummodo, ut Euphorbus in Pythagoram, Homerus in Pavum, recenseantur. Certè recidivatum animæ corporalem pronuntiaverunt; tolerabilius mutatâ quàm negatâ qualitate: pulsatâ saltem, licet non aditâ veritate. Ita sæculum, resurrectionem mortuorum, nec quum errat, ignorat.

^b Sic etiam conditionem renascendi sapientium clariores; Pythagoras primus, & præcipuus Plato, corruptâ & dimidiatâ fide tradiderunt. Nam corporibus dissolutis solas animas vultunt & perpetuò manere, & in alia nova corpora sæpius commeari. Addunt istis & illa ad retorquendam veritatem, in pecudes, aves, belluas, hominum animas redire. Non Philosophi sane studio, sed mimico vitio digna ista sententia est. Sed ad propositum satis est, etiam ip hoc sapientes vestros in aliquem modum nobiscum consonare.

^a L. 7. c. 23. Quâ de anastasi Philosophi quæque dicere aliquid conati sunt; tam corruptè quàm Poetæ. Nam Pythagoras transire animas in nova Corpora disputavit, &c.

The *Third* Opinion which I think deserves to be taken notice of, is that concerning the equal duration of the *Body* and *Soul*; that the *Soul* should indeed remain after Death, but not unless the *Body* did so too. This was the Doctrine of some of the *Stoicks*, and my Author is *Servius*. *Animam* (says he) *tandem durare dicunt, quamdiu durat & Corpus.*

* *Observ.
de locis
memorab.,
in Asia, &c.*

Corpus. The *Egyptians* had an Opinion amongst 'em, much the same with this. It is commonly said by those that speak of the Custom of the *Egyptians*, of embalming the Bodies of their Dead, such as * *Petrus Bellonius*, and others, that the Reason why they were so careful to preserve their Bodies, was, because they expected a *Resurrection*. But this indeed was not the Reason. The true Reason was this ; They believ'd the Soul never left the dead Body, but always adher'd to it as long as it lasted, how long soever that were ; and after the dissolution of the Body they believ'd the Soul was to enter into another. For this also *Servius* is my Author. So others tell us, that they were wont to keep the dead Bodies of their Friends in their Houses, and their Closets, and to set 'em at Table, as Guests, at Meals with 'em ; believing that they had there the whole Man, not only the *Body*, but the *Soul* too. *Lucian* † assures us, he himself had din'd in *Egypt* with such Guests. Hence *Silius*, the Poet :

—— *Ægyptia tellus*

*Clandit odorato post funus stantia saxo
Corpora, & à mensis exanguem baud separat umbram.*
The

The *Fourth* Opinion which I shall commend to your Consideration, is this, That these very Bodies of ours are capable of being made Immortal and Incorruptible, and of being translated up into Heaven, there to inhabit everlastingly in Union with the Soul? Did any of the *Heathens* believe thus much? They did so. 'Twas the Doctrine of the *Chaldaick* Philosophers, and likewise of the *Greeks* themselves. *Pfellus*, in his *Gloss* on the *Chaldaick Oracles*, tells us, that it was a Doctrine of those Philosophers, That a Man's Body may by the Works of Religion (Lustrations, and the like) be so purged and attenuated, the impure Matter being consumed by the Heavenly Fire, as that the Soul may carry it up to Heaven with it. That *Hercules*, and *Helena*, and others, amongst the *Greeks*, and *Romulus* amongst the *Romans*, were translated (like *Enoch* and *Elias*) into Heaven in their proper Bodies, we read in divers of our Ancient Authors. The Emperor * *Julian* mentions the *Assumption* of *Hercules*. He went up (says he) *ἔλαβεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν πύργον*. Tho' he will not acknowledge, that his Body with which he ascended was a Body of *Flesh*, but intimates, according to the Notion of the *Chaldaick* Philosophers, that the gross parts

* *Orat. 7.*
p. 312. &
Orat. 7. p.
402, 409.

parts of his Body were consumed by Heavenly Fire, or Lightening. That the *Romans*, when *Romulus* was murder'd, were made believe, that he had been taken up in his Body into Heaven, I need only mention, not endeavour to prove. It is what you know very well, and many of the Writers of the Roman History speak of it. The Emperor (a) *Julian* believ'd it, tho he says, as he does of *Hercules*, that the τὸ θνητὸν τῷ σώματι, the mortal part of his Body was consum'd or lick'd up πρὸς κατανάλωσιν by the Heavenly fire, or *Lightning*. That *Helena*, being like to be murdered, was taken up publickly into Heaven, † *Isaacus Porphyrogenetus* relates from the Traditions of the Ancient *Greeks*. * *Plutarch* tells us that it was the common Opinion of the *Greeks*, that *Cleomedes Astypalensis* was translated in his Body into Heaven, and that many others had been so translated. Thus * *Philostratus* doubts whether his greatly admir'd *Apollonius Tyanens* ever died; and tells us of a Report, that, going into a Temple in *Lindus*, he was never seen afterwards. He mentions moreover a Tradition of the *Cretans*, that he was taken up into Heaven out of a Temple in *Crete*, a Voice being heard in the Temple as of Virgins singing, Στέρχεσθε, αἶψα, αἶψα

(a) *Orat.* 4.
p. 289.

† *De pra-*
termiſſis
ab Homero.
* *In Ro-*
mulo.

* *Vita A-*
pollonii,
l. 8. c. 12.

εἴη ἐς ἡέανον, εἴη. *Come from the Earth, come into Heaven, come.*

Fifthly, They did not only believe that many had been translated like *Enoch* and *Elias* into Heaven, but they also believ'd that the Souls of some others had been *after Death* re-united to their *Bodies*, and that so, by a *Resurrection*, they had been taken up into Heaven. That this was generally believed of *Aristæus* the *Proconnesian*, is asserted by many † *Heathen Writers*. And * *Plutarch* assures us, that it was commonly believ'd that the *Body* of *Alcmena*, the Mother of *Hercules*, was taken up into Heaven after her Death. It happened, as they say, when it was carried out to be interr'd. Thus (says he) † *they ex-*
alt those things which are by nature Mortal among the Gods. He does not believe these Reports himself; on the contrary he calls it a *Foolish thing to place Earth in Heaven.* The Soul (says he) only is from the Gods, from them it came, and to them it returns, not with the Body, but separated wholly from it, perfectly pure, clean, and freed from Flesh. The Soul, as *Heraclitus* says, flies from the Body as *Lightening* does from a Cloud. While it is in the Body, like a heavy and cloudy Vapour, it is difficultly kindled, and with great difficulty

† *Plutarch*
in Romulo.
Herodotus,
l. 4. c. 13,
14, 15.
 * *l. c.*

† *Ex David.*
ζουτες τα
θνητα &
φύσας α-
μα τοις θε-
οις, p. 35.

scilicet it ascends to the things above. Therefore the Bodies of Good Men ought not by any means to be placed in Heaven, contrary to their Nature, but we ought to believe that the Soul alone ascends up thither. He disputes against this Belief, and these Traditions of the Heathens, in the very same manner as he would have disputed against *Christians*.

The *Sixth* Opinion of the *Heathens* which I shall present you with, is concerning a *Resurrection* of the very same *Human* Body, after its dissolution. In this only it differs from our *Christian* Doctrine, that it makes the Soul return, not immediately to those Particles from which it was separated by Death, and which were laid in the Grave, so as that those who died *Men*, should rise of the same *Stature*, but first to those Particles, which were united to it in the Mothers Womb: And afterwards those Particles that constituted the Body in its several Ages, are, according to this Opinion, to rise again, and be united all in their due time to the same Soul; 'till at last the same Particles that were buried shall be all re-united together, and constitute the Body in the very same manner as formerly. They tell us, that after the expiration of many Thousands of Years, when

when all the same *Stars* and *Planets* shall return to the same *Configuration* and *Respect* that they formerly had to one another, there shall be a *Resurrection* of all things to their former State, not only of *Men*, but all other things in the World. *Socrates*, for Example, shall be born again of the same Mother, and grow up in the same manner, with all the same *Circumstances*, teach Philosophy at *Athens* to the self-same Scholars, eat the self-same *Diet*, and wear the self-same *Cloths*, be accused by the same Accusers, condemn'd by the same Judges, and die by the same *Poison*. You and I (my Friend) are, according to them to, live here again in all the same *Circumstances* : Our *Friendship* the same, and the same *Correspondence* between us. You are to send again to me, to know what I have to say for the *Doctrine* of the *Resurrection* : I am to send you this very same *Treatise*, written on the same *Paper*, and with the same *Pen* and *Ink* ; and the *Hair*, that now makes this *Blot* , must make the same again. Thus all things must go on in a continual *Round* and *Revolution*, and by a continual successive *Resurrection*. But who are they that tell us these things ? Who were they that taught this Opinion ? The *Pythagoreans*,

* *Contra
Celsum,*
l. 5. p. 245.

(a) *Vita
Pythag.*
p. 188.

* *Ὅτι καὶ
περίοδος*

τίνας τὰ γινόμενα ποτὲ πάλιν γίνεται νόον δὲ εἶδέν αὐτῶς ἐστὶ.

and the *Platonists*, amongst the *Greeks*, and many of the *Priests* or *Philosophers* of *Egypt*, from whom the *Greeks* learnt it. Would you have me quote my *Author*? It is *Origen*, and not he only (tho' he alone were *enow*) but I have likewise several others. *The Followers of Pythagoras and Plato* (says * *Origen*) say, that after a certain Revolution of the Stars, when they shall return to the same Configuration and Respèct to one another, which they formerly had, there will necessarily be the very same Face of Things here on Earth, which there had been before, when the Stars were in the same Position. And according to this Notion, when the Stars shall return to the same Order, which they were in in *Socrates's* time, *Socrates* must be born again, and suffer the same things which he did before; the same *Anytus* and *Melitus* accusing him, and the same *Arcopagites* passing Sentence upon him: And the same is the *Dætrine* of the *Egyptians*. For *Pythagoras*, *Porphyry* (a) likewise is my Witness. It is well known to all, says he, first that he asserted the Immortality of the Soul; and that he asserted that the Soul passes into several kinds of Creatures; and moreover, that he taught, that after certain (b) Revolutions (of the Stars) those things,

things which once had been, shall be again, and that there is nothing properly new. For Plato I might produce his own Words, and the Testimonies of others, such as *Proclus*, &c. But who has not heard of Plato's *great Year*? I need not put you in mind, that this can be nothing else but an old Tradition concerning our future Resurrection, a little alter'd by the dropping of a part of it as it passed in a long series of time, through the Mouths of several Persons.

It appears from the Testimony of *R. Abraham Bar Chaia*, cited by * *Abar-*^{* *Ap. Pe-*}
binel, that this same Opinion concerning ^{*cock. Not.*}
the Restitution of all things to their former State, after the return of the Planets ^{*in Portam*}
to their former Configuration, was likewise received by many of the Philosophers of *India*. Some of 'em held that ^{*Mosis,*}
this should happen after the Term of ^{*p. 146.*}
4320000 Years, others assign'd 360000 Years, others 49000, others 36000, others 12000, others 7000; And *Bar Chaia* declares that he thinks *they form'd this Notion from the Tradition which they had received from their Ancestors, concerning the Resurrection.*

M. Varro, the great Roman Writer, in the Books which he publish'd † *De* † ^{*Ap. S.*}
Gente Populi Romani, speaks of certain ^{*Aug. de*}
C 2 Au- ^{*Civ. XXII.*}
28.

Authors, whom he calls *Genethliaci* whose Opinion it was, that the Soul returns, and is united to the very same Body, to which it had been formerly conjoyn'd, by a *παλιγγενεσία* in the space of 440 years. His Words are these: *Genethliaci quidam scripserunt, esse in re-nascendis hominibus quam appellant παλιγγενεσίαν Græci: hanc scripserunt confici in annis numero quadringentis quadraginta, ut idem Corpus & eadem anima, quæ fuerant conjuncta in homine aliquando, eadem rursus redeant in conjunctionem.*

Amongst others even of the Greek Philosophers, we find this Tradition preserv'd more entire. The *Stoicks*, though they look'd upon the Doctrine of the Resurrection, as preach'd by St. Paul at *Athens*, to be nothing but *Babble*, yet they themselves, as least some of 'em, tell us all the same things that the *Egyptians* but now mention'd, and the *Pythagoreans*, and the *Platonists* taught: But in this they come up nearer to us, that they do not make the World *Eternal*, but say, as we do, that the World shall be destroy'd by *Fire*, and that this Resurrection, or Re-stitution, of all things shall be after the general *Conflagration*. My Author for this, is first of all (a) *Origen*, and he a very good one in these Matters, who observes, not
with-

(a) C. Cel-
sum, l. 5.
p. 245.

without good Reason, that, tho they did not call it by the Name of a Resurrection, yet the Thing was the same. *The Stoicks, says he, hold, that after a certain revolution of Time, the Universe will be destroy'd by a Conflagration, and that immediately upon it all things will be restored to what they were before, without any manner of Change. But there are some amongst 'em that do not come up altogether to this Opinion, and They hold, that there will be some small Alteration, and for some short Time.*

These Men tell us, that after the Conflagration, † Socrates, for Example, shall be born again, an Athenian, the Son of Sophroniscus and Phenarete.

And therefore, tho' they do not call it by the Name of a Resurrection, yet they mean the same Thing. He shall be bred up,

say they, at Athens, and shall teach Philosophy there as before. So that Philosophy it self is as it were to rise again, and be in the same State as formerly. Anytus and Melitus shall rise again, and be Socrates's Accusers, and the Council of the Areopagites shall condemn him. And what is more ridiculous than all this, Socrates is to wear the same Cloths that he did before, live in the same Poverty, and with all

† P. 208. He says it was the Opinion of the Stoicks not that things should be numerically the same, but only in likeness; not that Socrates E. G. should be born again, but some one exactly like him, with all the like Circumstances.

the same Circumstances. So Phalaris shall again play the Tyrant, and torment the same Persons in his Brazen Bull. And Alexander the Pherean shall exercise his Cruelty on the same Persons that he did heretofore. Tatianus (a) mentions the same Opinion of Zeno; that the World shall be renewed by a Conflagration, that the same Men shall rise, and do the very same Things; Anytus and Melitus shall accuse Socrates again, Busiris murder his Guests, Hercules undergoe the same Labours, &c. (b) Lactantius produces these Words of Chrysippus, whom Cicero styles the Prop of the Porch of the Stoicks, out of his Book of Providence.

(a) Cont.
Græcos,
p. 143.

(b) De Vi-
ta Beata,
l. 7. c. 23.

(c) Τότε ὅτε ἔτις ἔχον-
τες, ἀλλ' ὅτε ἄς ἐν δ' ὁ ἰω-
τα, ὅτε ἔτις μὲν τὸ πάλαι
οὐκ, πάλαι ἀπελθόντων τῶ-
ν αἰώνων ἔτις ἐν
ὅτε ἰωτα ἐν δ' ὁ ἰωτα
ἐν δ' ὁ ἰωτα.

(c) This being so, it is mani-
fest, that it is not at all impos-
sible, but that after a certain
revolution of Time, even We
may be restored from Death to
what we now are. The Philo-

(d) Ap. Joseph
Euseb.
Præp. XV.
18, 19.

(d) Numenius calls it in express
Terms a Resurrection. Καὶ εἰς τὴν ἀνάστασιν
ἐνέστανται τὴν πάλαι ἐμνησθὲν τὴν μέγιστον, &c.
That Resurrection which makes that which
is call'd the greatest Year. This Opinion
of the Stoicks concerning the Renovati-
on of things after the Conflagration, is
mention'd by many others, as by (e) Tul-
ly,

(e) 2. De
Nat. Deo-
rum, c. 46.

ly, (b) Philo *Judeus*, (c) *Justin Martyr*,
 (d) *Athenagoras*, (e) *Clemens Alexandri-*
nus, &c.

(b) *Quid
mundus sit
corruptibi-*
lus. p. 728.

(c) *Apolog.* 2. p. 66. (d) *Apolog. pro Christi.* (e) *Strom.* 5.
 p. 549. 599.

The Emperor (f) *M. Antoninus*, who (f) l. 12.
 was chiefly addicted to the Sect of the c. 12. §. 5.
Stoicks, writes doubtingly concerning
 the Life to come, to this purpose. *How*
comes it to pass, says he, *That the Gods,*
who have order'd all things well, and with
singular love towards Mankind, have ne-
glect'd this one thing, to take care, that
Men, especially the Good, and those who
maintain'd as it were a frequent Correspon-
dence with 'em, and by their pious Works,
and holy Offices contract'd a kind of fami-
liarity with 'em; that those Men when once
they are dead, do no longer exist, but are
extinct for ever? Ἐπειδὴν ἀπαξ ἀποθνήσκον,
 μὴκεν αὖθις γίνεσθαι, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸ παντελὲς
 ἀπεσβέναι. If it be so, the reason, you
 must know, is, because it ought not to be other-
 wise. This Place the learned (a) *Merich* (a) *Notis*
Casaubon understands so, as if it had re- in *M. An-*
 spect to the Resurrection of the Body, tonin. and
 in the true Christian Sense, and the in his *Book*
 Words, μὴκεν αὖθις γίνεσθαι, he ren- of *Credul.*
 ders thus, *should never be restored to and Incred.*
 Life. "That *Antoninus* (says he) intends p. 23.

" it of the Body (for the Soul, if not
 " immortal, yet that it remain'd a long
 " time after Death, they believ'd) not of
 " the Body alone, but of the Body and
 " Soul to be join'd again into one and the
 " same Person, may appear, because he
 " saith, ἐπειδὴν ἅπαρ ἀποθάνωσι, *as soon*
 " *as ever dead*, μηκέτι αὖθις γίνεσθαι, not to
 " be restored to Life again; to wit, the
 " Man, consisting (though not a precise
 " *Stoick* in that) of Body and Soul for
 " ever. That the Emperor intended
 such a Resurrection, he further con-
 firms by another Passage in his Book,
 where he says, (a) ἀναβιβῆναι σοι ἔξουσιν
 ἰδεῖν πάλιν τὰ παλαιὰ, ὡς ἔωρας ἐν τέτρῳ
 ἢ τὸ ἀναβιβῆναι. You will easily be per-
 suaded, that I am not at all prejudiced
 against this Opinion of that learned Man:
 But let Truth prevail above all things.
 It must be confess'd, that he did not un-
 derstand *Antoninus's* meaning, and that
 he was mistaken in *two* Respects: 1. If
Antoninus had intended a Resurrection,
 he ought to have been understood only
 of such a Resurrection, as I have shewn
 the *Stoicks* generally believ'd. 2. It is
 not true that he intended a *Resurrection*
 in any Sense. In this last place he only
 alludes to that Opinion which the *Sto-*
icks commonly taught, not asserts it:
 And

(a) L. 7.
 §. 2.

And in the other Place he only speaks of the duration of the *Soul* after Death, of which he himself doubted. It must be acknowledged, that that *Philosopher* had too mean an Opinion of the Body, to propose it as a thing to be wonder'd at, why the *Bodies* of good Men are not to be rais'd again. And the Word *αὐθις*, on which *Casaubon* lays a great Stress, and which seems to be the Foundation of his Error, signifies not only, again, as he renders it, but *amplius*, or *in posterum*. So in *Philo Judæus* ὁ αὐθις χρόνος is the time to come, in *Isocrates* οἱ αὐθις signifies *Posterity*. In the same Sense it is used by *Plato*, and others.

I might here observe, that the *Philosopher* *Heraclitus*, more ancient than the *Stoicks*, speaks not only of the general Conflagration, but says, (a) that they that have lived ill in this Life shall be purged by that Fire. I might likewise observe that both he, and (b) *Anaximenes*, and (c) *Diogenes Apolloniates*, believ'd, That after the destruction of this World, there will be another Created, and so on to all Eternity. But I rather chuse to entertain you with some thing that I think will be more surprizing, and more to our Purpose. Should I tell you that those

(a) See
Clem. Alex.
l. 5. p. 449,
599.

(b) *Simplicius Com.*
in *Arist.*

Phys. l. 8.

(c) *Ibid.*

those two great *Atomical* Philosophers, *Democritus* and *Epicurus*, believ'd, that our Bodies will hereafter be restor'd again, and be made up of the very same Particles; should I tell you thus much, you would take me perhaps to be rather *pleasant* than *serious*. But how strange soever you may think it, it is nevertheless true, at least if my Authors were not mistaken. They believ'd that this will happen after a vast distance of time, and after innumerable changes, by a Second fortuitous concourse of the very same Particles. *Democritus* (as I suppose) form'd this Notion from what he had learnt concerning the Instauration of all Things, by conversing with the *Egyptians*, among whom (we know) he lived many Years to be instructed in their Philosophy: And from him, it is likely, *Epicurus* receiv'd it. But how does it appear, that those two great *Corporealists*, who believ'd that the *Soul* and *Body* die both together, asserted this kind of *Resurrection*? For *Democritus*, *Pliny* is my Author; for *Epicurus*, *St. Jerom.* *Pliny* (a) in his *Nat. Hist.* opposes and derides this Opinion of *Democritus* (so he does also the Immortality of the Soul.) *Similis est de asservandis corporibus hominum, ac reviviscendi promissa Democrito vanitas,*

(a) L. 7.
c. 55.

vanitas, qui non * *revixit ipse. Quæ (ma-* * *The Au-*
lum) ista clementia est iterari vitam mor- *thor seems*
te? S. Jerom's (a) Words concerning E- *to intimate*
picurus are these: Vide, hoc novum est, & *that De-*
jam factum est in seculo quod fuit ante nos. *mocritus*
Cum superioribus autem congruit, quod ni- *spoke of a*
hil novum in mundo fiat, nec sit aliquis *Resurrelli-*
qui possit existere & dicere, ecce hoc no- *on which*
vum est, siquidem omne quod se putaverit *was to be*
novum ostendere, jam in prioribus seculis *in a little*
fuit. Nec putemus signa atque prodigia *time: But*
& multa quæ arbitrio Dei nova in Mun- *I believe*
do sunt, in prioribus seculis esse jam facta, *he had not*
& locum invenire Epicurum, qui asserit *duly confi-*
per innumerabiles periodos EADEM *der'd his*
& eisdem in locis & per eosdem fieri. *Opinion.*
 There is no reason we should change
 the Reading, and for Epicurus, read,
Chrysippus, as a (a) learned Man suspects (a) *Me-*
 we ought, since (as has been shewn) *vic. Casaub.*
Democritus himself, whose Philosophy *of Cred.*
Epi- *and Incred.*
curus follow'd, and from whom the An- *p. 22.*
 cients tell us he borrow'd a great many
 of his Notions, maintain'd either the
 same or a like Opinion.

I shall conclude these Opinions with
 those receiv'd among some of the An-
 cient *Arabians*. The *Harbanists* (b), an (b) *Po-*
 ancient Sect among the Heathen *Arabi-* *cock. Spe-*
ans, held, That after the space of 36425 *cim. Hist.*
 Years, all the *Species* of Living Crea- *Arabum,*
 tures *p. 145.*

tures that are in the World shall be destroy'd, and the *Nature of the Universe* shall again produce Two Pair of every *Species* for every Climate of the Earth. And after this manner the World is to continue by several Revolutions to Eternity. There were others among the *Arabians* that agreed with the *Pythagoreans* and *Platonists*, or rather came up more home to the Christian Doctrine than they did. They believ'd, that after certain Circulations of the Heavenly Bodies, the Soul will return, and will constitute the same Individual Man, and that the Man thus constituted anew, will remember what had past in the former Life. (a) *Abrahamus Ecchelensis* mentions this as the Opinion of some Ancient *Hereticks* amongst the *Mahometans* in *Egypt*, and elsewhere: And you know the *Mahometans* of *Egypt* were originally *Arabians*.

(a) *Euty-
chio Vind.*
P. 417.

We have made, I think, by this time, a pretty tolerable Progress, and from the *View* we have already taken, I believe you begin to be convinced, that the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body was known and generally embrac'd in the first Ages of the World. We will now extend our View, and look a little farther abroad into the
World,

World, and shew, that the Heathens had not only some Opinions amongst 'em which were built on a Tradition concerning the Resurrection, and that carry with 'em a very great resemblance of our Doctrine; but that many of 'em in several parts of the World have held the same Doctrine with us, and do to this day believe it, in the same sense as we understand it; I mean, that they hold, That the Particles of the Body which died will be rais'd again, and, without a *new Birth*, be united to the Soul, and constitute the very same Man.

I shall not here take any notice of those *Greek Verses* which are extant under the Name of *Phocylides*, that they plainly assert the *Resurrection*, in regard those *Verses* are by all learned Men attributed, not to the Ancient *Phocylides*, but to some *Jewish* or *Christian* Author. The *First* Instance which I shall present you with, is that of the *Persian Magi*. I need not tell you that the *Magi* were the Priests and Philosophers of the Ancient *Persians*. *Theopompus*, and *Eudemus Rhodius*, two very Ancient Authors, in (a) *D. Laertius*, tell us, that the *Ma-* (a) *Pro-*
gi taught, That Men shall revive, and be *mis*.
Immortal. Ἀναβιωσάμενοι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, καὶ
 ἰσάμενοι

(b) *De Is.* ἑσθιὶν ἀθανάτους. And (b) *Plutarch* assures *Osir.* p. 370. Ἐναβίον καὶ μίαν πολιτείαν ἀνθρώπων μακροβίων καὶ ὁμοῦ λαῶν ἀπάντων γυνήδεσσι. us out of the Books of *Zoroastres*, that according to their Doctrine there will be a time, when the Earth shall be made plain and level, and all Mankind shall live blessedly together on Earth, in one common Society, and shall speak but one Language. This is almost expressly the *Millennarian Doctrine* of the *Resurrection*.

(c) *Ap. Plut. loco cit.* They add, according to (c) *Theopompus*, that this shall happen after the term of 6000 Years. Which is the same number of Years that the Ancient *Jews*, and most of the Christian Fathers allow for the duration of the World, before the *Resurrection*: And that the Bodies of Men in that State will not have need of Food, but will be pure and pellucid, or, as he expresses it, will cast

(a) *Theophrasto*, p. 77. Ὅτι δὲ Ζωροάστρης προλέγει, ὡς ἔσται ποτὲ χρόνος ἐν ᾧ πάντων νεκρῶν ἀνάστασις ἔσται. Ὅτι δὲν ὁ Θεόπομπος ὁ λέγων καὶ πάλιν ἄλλος αὐτοῦ ἐκδιδάσκει. no Shadow. Thus (a) *Aeneas Gazæus* affirms that *Zoroastres* foretold, that there will come a time, when there shall be a *Resurrection* of all the Dead. And this, says he, *Theopompus* attests.

To this I shall add what is also very remarkable, that the same Doctrine is at this day preserv'd amongst the Heathen *Gavrs*, or *Guebarezs*, at this time living in *Persia*, the Remains of the Ancient *Magi*, or *Persians*. My
Author

Author is a late (b) Traveller of good ^{(b) Trav.}
 Credit, who gives us this Account: ^{hier. l. 4.}
 That according to their Doctrine, ^{c. 8. p. 165.} there
 shall be an Universal Resurrection: And at
 that time all the Souls either in Paradise
 or Hell, shall return to take possession of their
 Bodies; that the Earth shall be made level,
 and Men shall have every one their Apart-
 ment answerable to the Good which they
 did in their Life-time, but that their chief
 Delight shall be to behold and praise God,
 and (Zoroastres) their Prophet. They add
 that before the Resurrection, those that are
 in Paradise do not behold the Face of God.
 They likewise say, that their Prophet did
 not die, but was carried up in his Body
 into Heaven.

My second Instance is of some of the
Arabians. I shew'd but just now that
 some of the ancient *Arabians* came up
 very near to our Doctrine: I shall now
 add, that there were others of that Coun-
 try, (which is very spacious and contain'd
 very different Sects) that made a fur-
 ther Advance, and came up fully to us.
 That the most ancient *Arabians* acknow-
 ledged the Resurrection in the *Christian*
 Sense, we may probably gather from
 that noted Place in (a) *Job* concerning (a) ^{c. 19.}
 the Resurrection, at least if the Words ^{v. 26.}
 be rightly understood, and were really
 spoken

spoken by him. I need not tell *you* that *Job* was an *Arabian*. But *you* perhaps will tell *me*, that that was spoken by him *only* as an *inspir'd* Person. I see no Reason for that : But this is not the only Argument I have to prove, that the old *Arabians* expressly own'd our Doctrine. I have the express Testimony of several *Arabick* Writers, that some of 'em did so. *There were some among the Hea-*

(b) *Hist.*
Dynast.
P. 101.

then Arabians (says (b) *Gregorius Abulpharajius*) that acknowledged the Resurrection of the Dead. He adds, that they used to kill a *Camel* on the Graves of the Dead, that *when they should rise to Judgment* (such was their Ignorance mixt with the Knowledge they had of the Truth) they

might ride upon it. The same

(a) *Pocockius Specim.*
Hist. Arabum, p. 134.
Fuisse ex Arabibus dicit
Sharestanius alios qui nec
præcessisse creationem
crederent, nec futuram
resurrectionem ; rerum
ortum naturæ, interitum
seculo deberi asserentes ;
alior, qui res omnes crea-
tas agnoscerent, at res-
titutum iri mortuos ne-
garent ; alios demum qui
utrumque saterentur.

is asserted by other *Arabick* (a) Authors. I know that one *Kossus* (He of whom is that *Arabick* Proverb, *More Eloquent than Kossius*) is reported by some to have taught the *Arabians* the Doctrine of the Resurrection, as also the Unity of the God-head : But that is to be understood only of *some*, not of all the *Ara-*

bians that own'd it. My Opinion is, that *Kossus* was no other than a Christian
Pres-

Presbyter, who first preach'd the Gospel in some part of *Arabia*: For so the Word *Kos* or *Kas* signifies in the Arabick Tongue; I mean it signifies a *Presbyter*, and his *eloquent* Preaching might very well occasion the above-mention'd Proverb. Now it does not seem very probable, that they who are spoken of by *Abulpharajius*, who were wont to have a *Camel* buried with 'em, were descended from any who had been enlighten'd by the Gospel.

My *Third* Instance is of some of the *Banians* of *Cambaia*, in the *East-Indies*. A Traveller (a) of our own Nation tells us, that a *Banian* of *Cambaia* gave an Acquaintance of his this Account of their Faith, relating to the next Life. *Law* (says he) they hold none, but only seven Precepts, which they say were given 'em from their Father *Noe*, not knowing *Abraham* nor any other. 1. To honour Father and Mother. 2. Not to steal. 3. Not to commit Adultery. 4. Not to kill any Thing living. 5. Not to eat any Thing living. 6. Not to cut their Hair. 7. To go bare-foot in their Churches. They hold there shall be a Resurrection, and all shall come to Judgment, but the Account shall be most strict, insomuch that but one of 10000 shall be receiv'd to Favour, and those shall live again in this World in great Happiness: The rest shall be tormented.

(a) Mr. Rich. Wrag in Hackluit tom. 2. p. 310.

And because they will escape this Judgment, when any Man dies, he is burnt to Ashes, and thrown into a River. And by this means they hope to escape the Judgment to come. As for the Soul, that goeth to the Place from whence it came, but where the Place is they know not. That the Body should not be made again they reason with the Philosophers, saying, that of nothing nothing can be made; beholding the course of Nature that nothing is made but by a means, as by the Seed of an Animal is made another, and by Corn cast into the Ground there cometh up new Corn. So, say they, a Man cannot rise again except some part of him be left undissolv'd, and therefore they burn the whole. For if he were buried in the Earth, they say there is a small Bone in the Neck which would never be consum'd. Or if he were eaten by a Beast, that Bone would not consume, but of that Bone would come another Man; and then the Soul being restored again he should come to Judgment, whereas now, the Body being destroy'd, the Soul shall not be judged. For their Opinion is, That both Body and Soul must be united together as they have sinn'd together, to receive Judgment: and therefore the Soul alone cannot. Their Seven Precepts, which they keep very strictly, they do not keep for any hope of Reward
they

they have after this Life, but only that they may be blessed in this World. They say, the Three chief Religions in the World are of the Christians, Jews, and Mahometans, and yet but one of them True. But being in doubt which is the truest of the Three, they will be of None. For they hold that all these Three shall be judged, and but few of them which be of the True shall be saved, the Examination shall be so strict. They say these Three Religions have too many Precepts to keep them all well, and therefore wonderful hard it will be to give an Account, because so few do observe all their Religion aright. This Account is the more considerable for what it mentions of *Noah*: and I should be glad to tell you, that I find it confirm'd by other Relations of those Parts. But that, I must own, I cannot as yet do. On the contrary I know that the *Banians* of *Cambaia*, and of other Parts, do not generally talk after this manner, or own explicitly a *Resurrection*, but the *Transmigration* of Souls into other Bodies. Nevertheless it is not improbable but that among those many Sects of the *Banians*, or Gentiles, of *Mogulistan*, whose Opinions we find describ'd in our more vulgar Relations, there may be some, particularly in *Cambaia*, who have these Tra-

ditions and Notions. And this is th
more credible, because (as I shall by and
by shew) there are other Nations in the
Indies, which assert a *Resurrection*. Those
Brachmans of *India*, of whom we read
in the Histories of *Alexander the Great*,
were either of that Country which is
now call'd *Cambaia*, or of a Country
bordering upon it : And *Palladius*, in
his *Treatise of the Brachmans*, makes *Dan-*
damis, the most Famous and Considera-
ble amongst 'em, speak of the *Resurrecti-*
on. He, in his Discourse with *Alexan-*
der, has these Words : *Thou shalt not*
lie hid from God, neither shalt thou have
any Place to which thou mayest flee at the
time of the (a) Resurrection. Neither shalt
thou escape his Vengeance. But as that
Discourse is altogether fictitious, so the
Author's Judgment, who makes him talk
after this manner, deserves not to be
regarded.

(a) 'Οὐδὲ
τότοις ἔτι
εἰς οὐρανὸν
ἐν τῷ τῶν
ἀνθρώπων

(b) Knox
Hist. of
Ceylon.
P. 85.

My *Fourth* Example is the Inhabitants
of the Island of *Ceylon*, in the *East-Indies*.
These People, says another (b) Travel-
ler of our own Nation, (who liv'd a-
mongst 'em no less than 19 Years, and
could not but be very well acquainted
with their Belief) do firmly believe a *Re-*
surrection of the Body, and the Immortali-
ty of Souls, and a future State. They hold
that

that in the other World, those that are good Men, tho' they be poor and mean in this World, yet there they shall become high and Eminent ; But wicked Men, they say, will be turned into Beasts.

The Fifth is the Inhabitants of Java, another of the East-Indian Isles, who believe, as (a) Le Blanc affirms, that after their Flesh is wholly consum'd, their Soul will re-unite to the Body, and remain in Peace to all Eternity. (a) Trav. Part I. c. 24. P 97.

The Sixth is the People of Pegu, another Country in the East-Indies. It's affirm'd by a (b) Roman Missionary, who lived amongst 'em some years, that they believe a Vivification of the Body after Death, and re-union with the Soul. (b) Bonferrus cited by Sir Tho. Herbert in his Trav. p. 359.

The Seventh is the People of Transiana, a Country adjoining to Pegu, on the North of it ; who, when they bury a dead Body, burn the Heart and Bowels, as a Sacrifice to their Duma or God ; then put the Ashes within the Corpse again, (a) That nothing, as they say, may be wanting at the Day of Resurrection. (a) Le Blanc. c. 36 p. 168.

The Eighth is some of the Chinese. Gaspar Da Cruz (c) gives us this Account of the Opinions of some of that Nation. They make (says he) many Heavens, some where there is Meat and Drink, and fair Women, whither all living things do (c) Treatise of China.

go. . And to these they say, all Men do go, that are not of the Religious. They place others higher, whither they say the holy Priests do go that live in the Wilderneſſes, and all the Felicity they give them there, is to sit refreshing themselves with the Wind. They place others yet higher, the Gods of which they say have round Bodies like Bowls; those that go to these Heavens have round Bodies as the Gods themselves have. The same Author tells us, That they wear their Hair long, holding, that by it they shall be carried to Heaven. That the Priests are generally shaven, for they say, They need no help to carry them to Heaven. This might pass, I presume, with many for a full and sufficient Proof, that they own a Resurrection : But I do not my-self rely on it. These Opinions might be grounded on the gross Notion they might have of the Materiality of the Soul. I mention'd in the beginning of this Discourse, that the Heathens generally believe, that the Soul has all the same Parts that the Body has : They believe that the Parts of the Soul, when the Soul is united to the Body, are diffused throughout all the Parts of the Body, that if a man's Body has Hair, his Soul has Hair too ; and that if you cut off his Hair, you cut off together with it the Hair of the Soul.

That

That some in that great and populous Empire acknowledge a *Resurrection*, is more plainly asserted by others. Pinto (a) ^{(a) Voyag.} tells us of a Sect named *Trimechan*, who ^{P 145.} are of Opinion, That *so long as a Man lives in this World, so long shall he remain under Ground, 'till at length, by the Prayers of the Priests, his Soul shall re-assume the Body of a Child of Seven Days old, wherein he shall live again till he shall grow so strong as to re-enter into the old Body which he left in the Grave, and so be translated into the Heaven of the Moon; where, they say, he shall live many Years, and in the end be converted into a Star, which shall remain fixt above in the Firmament for ever.* The same Author (if he deserve that Name, and be not rather in this, as he is in a great many of his Stories, a *Romancer*) has another Relation which makes directly to our Purpose. It is somewhat long, and I fear you will think it tedious, perhaps ridiculous; but however I shall here present you with it, because, as I remember, you have not the Author in your Library. I must ingenuously confess, I do not my-self much believe it: But I must not make my Judgment the Rule of other Men's. It may perhaps be true, at least some part of it, tho' the Prejudice which I

D 4

have

have against the Relator, makes it seem very doubtful to me. If after you have read it, you think it unworthy of this place, before you shew these Papers to any of your Friends be pleas'd to strike it quite out, or let it be lookt upon only as a

(a) C. 35. *Parentthesis.* He tells us (a) "of a place
S. 2 p. 140. "in *Pequin*, the chief City of *China*, call'd the *Treasure of the Dead*, in which
"are many little Houses, according to
"the Report of the *Chinese*, no less than
"3000, full of dead Men's *Skulls*, with
"Two great Mounts of their other *Bones* :
"That there is a Register kept of those
"*Bones* and *Skulls*, to whom they belong'd. In that place, says he, there are
"Two great *Idols*, call'd *The Blowers of*
"*the House of Smoak*, (so the *Chinese* use to call *Hell*) and the Figure of a Mon-
"strous Serpent, call'd, *The gluttonous Serpent of the House of Smoak*,
"with a great Bowl of Iron on his Head,
"as if it had been thrown at him from
"some other place; and near it another great Figure in the form of a Giant holding a great Iron Bowl aloft in
"his Hands, and beholding the Serpent
"with a frowning and angry Countenance, he seems as if he would throw
"his Bowl at him. Round about this
"Figure is a number of little *Idols* on
"their

“ their Knees, with their Hands lifted
 “ up as if they would adore it. But
 what means all this long Story? What
 (you will say) are these *Houses of Skulls*,
 these *Giants, Serpents, and Bowls*, to our
 Purpose? The Explication he gives of all
 these things, is this: *All this great Edi-*
fice, says he, *was consecrated to the Honour*
of this Idol, call'd Mucluparon, whom the
Chinese affirm'd to be the Treasurer of all
the dead Bones, and that when the Glut-
tonous Serpent before-mentioned came to
steal them away, he made at him with the
Bowl which he held in his Hands, where-
upon the Serpent in great fear fled away to
the bottom of the profound House of Smoak,
whither God precipitated him for his great
Wickedness: And farther they affirm'd, that
he had maintain'd a Combat with him 3000
Years already, and was to continue the same
3000 Years more; so that from 3000 to
3000 Years he was to employ Five Bowls,
wherewith he was to make an end of kil-
ling him. Hereupon, they added, that
as soon as this Serpent should be dead, the
Bones that were there gathered together,
would return to the Bodies to which they
appertain'd formerly, and so should go and
remain for ever in the House of the Moon.
 To these Opinions (adds my Author) they
 join many others such like, unto which they
 give

give so much faith, that nothing can be able to remove them from it. For it is the Doctrine that is preach'd unto them by their Bonzees, who also tell them that the true way to make a Soul happy, is to gather the Bones of the Dead together into this Place; by means whereof there is not a day passes but a Thousand, or Two Thousand, Bones are brought thither. Now if some for their far distance cannot bring all the Bones whole together, they will at leastwise bring a Tooth or Two, and so they say, that, by way of an Alms, they make as good satisfaction as if they brought all the rest: Which is the reason that in all these Charnel-Houses there is such an infinite multitude of these Teeth, that one might lade many Ships with them. Thus far Pinto: I wish I could quote you a better Author. Tho the silence of all other Travellers who have given an Account of that Country, and particularly of the City of *Pequin*, and the oddness of the Story it self, be enough to perswade one that the whole is no better than an idle Fable; yet that which he says of the Combat maintain'd with the Devil 3000 Years already, and to be continued 3000 Years more, comes up so near to the Opinion of the Ancient Magi, those great Theologists
of

of the *East*, which * *Plutarch* gives an account of, that from thence it may be concluded that the whole is not fabulous, but that there may be some truth in it. For it is not likely that so illiterate a Person as *Pinto*, knew what *Plutarch* relates of the *Magi*. I shall leave the whole to your Judgment, and to the Enquiries of such as shall

hereafter visit that City. *Kircher* (a) (a) *China* mentions a Sect of the *Chinese* call'd *Lanzu*, *Illustr.* P. 133.

which, says he, *Paradisum spondet, ex animâ & corpore constitutis, & in suis templis quorundam effigies exponunt, quos hac ratione ad Cælos evolasse fabulantur. Ad eam rem consequendam exercitationes quasdam præscribunt, positas in vario sedendi ritu, certisque precationibus, imo etiam pharmacis, quibus spondent unâ cum suorum Divorum favore vitam in mortali corpore longiorem.* We read in (b) *Job. Lu-*

dovici Gotofridus, that the *Chinese* celebrate the Memory of Twelve certain Philo- (b) *Hist. India Orient. l. 1.* P. 93.

sophers, who, they say, were for their Vertue **Translated** into Heaven. And

(c) another affirms of the *Chinese* in general, That they believe a *Resurrection*: (c) *Herbert in his Trav.* P. 377.

it,

* *De Is. & Osir. p. 270.*
Theopompus ait de Sententia Magorum vicibus 3000 annorum alterum Deorum superare, alterum succumbere: Et per alia 3000 annorum bellum eos inter se gerere, pugnare, & alterum alterius opera demoliri: tandem Plutonium deficere, & tunc Homines fore beatos, neque alimento utentes, neque umbram edentes.

it, That *sometimes they will lend Money to be repaid 'em in the other World.* This is reported of *some* amongst 'em by several Travellers: But whether it be a sufficient Argument, I leave to the Judgment of others.

The *Ninth* is the Eastern *Tartars*, who
 (a)p. 163. inhabit on the North of *China*. (a) *Pinto*, whom I but now quoted, has a Relation concerning them much the same with what he has given us of the *Chinese*. He tells us that he saw in that Country, about the Temple of a Celebrated Idol, a great many Houses full of the Skulls and Bones of dead Men; the Idol very vast and monstrous, with a great Bowl of Iron in his Hands; and this is the Account he gives of it, from the Mouth, as he says, of a *Tartar* of no mean Quality: That *that Idol, or God, is the Treasurer of the Bones of all those that are born into the World, to the end that at the last Day, when Men come to be born again (he means rise again) he may give to every one the same Bones which he had upon Earth.* And that the Bowl he holds in his Hands, is to fling at the Devil, when he should come thither to steal away any of those Bones. I have told you my Author, one (as I have already hinted) whose Relations I dare not *Insure*.

Out

Out of *Asia* we will pass, if you please, into *Africa*, and then into the other two parts of the World, and see if those parts afford us any other Examples.

My *Tenth* Instance is the People of *Arder*, a Country in *Guinee* near *Rio da Volta*. They believe (as the *Dutch* Relations assure us) that the Bodies of such as are slain in the Wars, do rise again within Two Days after they are buried, and go to another Life; and this they averr they have found by experience. This Opinion is cherish'd by their *Fetisero's*, or Priests, who steal (as we may suppose) the dead Bodies out of their Graves. They say that in the Bodies of those that are not slain in the Wars, the Blood congeals, and therefore they are not to expect a Resurrection.

The *Eleventh* is the *Prussians* here in *Europe*. That they, before they were converted to the *Christian Faith*, believ'd, not only the Immortality of the Soul, but also the *Resurrection* of the Body, is asserted by *Christophorus Hartknochius* (a), in his *Bornissia Vetus & Nova*.

The *Twelfth* is the *Virginians* in *America*. A *French* (b) Author tells us,

(a) *Apud
Acta Erudi-
torum
Lipsiensia.
Vol. 12.
p. 193.*

(b) *Hist. of the Caribby Isles*, l. 2. c. 14.

That

(c) Smith
in his Vir-
ginia, l. 2.
p. 36.

That they have a *small glimpse of this sacred Truth*. And a (c) Traveller of our own, who lived long among 'em, and has written a large Account of their Country and Manners, seems to intimate the same thing. His Words are as follows: *They think that their Werowances (i. e. their Governors) and Priests, when they are dead, go beyond the Mountains towards the setting of the Sun, and ever remain there in form of their Okee (i. e. their God, to whom they attribute a Human Shape) with their Heads painted with Oyl and Ponones (a Herb so called) finely trimmed with Feathers, and shall have Beads, Hatchets, Copper, and Tobacco, doing nothing but dance and sing, with all their Predecessors. But the Common People they suppose shall not live after Death, but rot in their Graves like dead Dogs.* In a Marginal Note he calls this expressly *their Resurrection*.

The Inhabitants of *Louisiana*, another Country in the Northern America, lately discover'd by the French, seem to hold, That the Soul after Death shall be re-united to its Body. My Author's Words are these, (a) *Animas superstites esse corporibus fatentur, & in Regione a-mena, resumptis Corporibus, venaturos esse mortuos, ungantur, eaque de causa instrui.*

(a) Ap. 4.
De Luf.
Vol. 1.
p. 379.

instrumenta, & arma sepulchris addunt, horumque utensilium spiritum etiam revivum esse aiunt.

Jarriens (b) relates, That the *Brasili-* (b) *Rerum Indicarum Thesaurus, To. 3. c. 18.*
ans, enslav'd by the Portuguese, used to boast that their Friends who died some Centuries of Years ago, would come thither again in a Ship, and free their Posterity from slavery, and root out the Portuguese: And had this Opinion current among 'em, That no one that believ'd this would be excluded Heaven; but they that did not, would be rent in pieces by wild Beasts.

It's storied (b) of the People of *Hisp.* (a) *Præfat. in Benjamin Hist.*
paniola, and the adjacent Isles, that the Spaniards carried away many of 'em to work in the Gold Mines, by persuading 'em that they should be carried away to the Seats of the Blessed where their deceas'd Ancestors were, and there live among them.

But these things may be resolv'd into that gross Notion which those ignorant People entertain'd of the Materiality of the Soul.

That the *Peruvians* acknowledged the *Resurrection of the Body*, before ever any Christians came into those Parts, is confidently asserted by several Authors, by (a) *Joh. Hugo Linschoten*, (b) *Hond.* (a) *Trav.*
 p. 156. 186. (b) *Hist. Missions Benedictionum in America,*
 v. 1. p. 1.

(c) *Trav.*
part 3. c.
11 & 14.

(d) *Hist.*
Navigat. in
Brasiliam
p. 224.

(e) *Hist.*
of the Ca-
ribby Isles,
l. 2. c. 14.

(f) L. 4.
c. 124.

(g) *Hist.* of
the West-
Indies, l. 3.
c. 3.

rius Philoponus, (c) *Le Blanc*, (d) *Lerius*, and others: and a (e) *French Writer* tells us, that *most Authors affirm it*. But I fear there are few, or none, that speak upon their own Knowledge. He, whom all the rest follow, is the Author of the (f) *General Hist. of India*, cited for it by *Lerius*. That Historian relates, That when the *Spaniards* rifled the Graves of the Dead for the Treasures that were wont to be buried with 'em, and carelessly threw about their *Bones*, the *Peruvians* entreated them not to scatter the *Bones* of the Dead, lest it should hinder their *Resurrection*. This is very plain and express. But I cannot (I confess) but doubt of the truth of it. For I find that (g) *Josephus Acosta*, a very good Author, expressly asserts the quite contrary; That tho' the *Peruvians* held the Immortality of the Soul, and that the *Good* are rewarded after Death, and the *Wicked* punished, yet they were not come to the knowledge of that Point, that the *Bodies* shall rise, and be again united to their *Souls*. Neither do I find any thing concerning the *Resurrection* in the large *Royal Commentaries* of the *Inca Garcilasso*.

You see (*Philaletes*) I am not willing to *abuse* you, by imposing upon you an Argument, which I think I have reason

son to doubt of. And moreover, I must tell ye, that it is not improbable but that there may be some others amongst the Modern Instances which I have laid before you, as particularly that of the *Virginians*, that hereafter may be found to be grounded on Mistakes. The truth is, the *First* Authors of Reports of this nature are oftentimes such as are either too Ignorant of the Language of those whose Opinions they give an Account of, to understand 'em aright, or not sufficiently Knowing and Judicious to distinguish rightly one Opinion from another. But, upon the whole, if you please to reflect on all that has been hitherto said, and consider all things together, I am of Opinion you will be very apt to lay down this Proposition at the *Foot* of the *Account*, That the Doctrine of the *Resurrection*, as we now understand it, is an old *Universal* Doctrine, deriv'd down from *Noah*, and grounded on the more ancient *Revelations* of the *Antediluvian* Patriarchs.

But why deriv'd down from *Noah*? Why grounded (perhaps you may ask) on the ancient Revelations of the *Antediluvian* Patriarchs? Might not the *Heathens* receive this Notion from the *Jews*? I know many Modern Writers, and some

of the Ancients, who contend that the Doctrine of the *Resurrection* was in some measure known to the *Gentiles*, give this account of it, that they learnt it of the *Jews* by reading the Scriptures, or by conversing with some of that Nation: But I leave it to your serious Judgment, whether this Account which I have given you of it, be not much more probable. How could so many different Nations, Nations so *Ancient* and so remote from *Judaea*, receive this Doctrine, or their *broken* Traditions concerning it, from the *Jews*? I could offer you many Arguments, and, I think, pretty good ones, to confute that common and ill-grounded Opinion, That most of those Notions in which the Ancient *Heathens* agreed with the *Jews*, were borrowed from them. But this is not a proper time for it. Are you apt to suspect that the *Notices* of the *Resurrection* which we find among the *Heathens* of *these present* Times were received from the *Missionaries* which the Church of *Rome* has of late sent abroad into the several Parts of the World? I must needs say, that, if I know any thing of these Matters, I know that that could not be. Will you say they were received from some *Christians*, or *Mahometans*,

tans, who in *former* times arriv'd in those Countries? This I grant may be true of some of 'em. But if you consider that before the times of *Christianity* there were manifest *Foot-steps* of this Doctrine to be found amongst the Heathens in *divers* Parts of the World as well as in these Days; and that the ancient *Magi* of the East did plainly assert it; as you will be forced to acknowledge that the whole cannot be accounted for that way, so (I think) it will seem very probable that the *present* Heathens themselves are beholding to their first Ancestors, and not to any *Christians* or *Mahometans*, for what they know concerning it. I take no notice of another Opinion very common amongst the *Fathers*, That the Doctrine of the *Resurrection* may be learnt from *Natural Reason*. I should be very glad to have it well prov'd, that the Doctrine of the *Resurrection* might be discover'd to those *Heathens* of whom we have spoken, by that light of *Nature*. But for my part I utterly despair of it. I know of no Natural Reason, no light of Nature so bright and shining as to discover this Mystery; and have therefore purposely forbore to make use of any of those Arguments which the *Fathers*, and some (a) of our Mo-

(a) *Bishop*
Payson on
the Creed,
p. 376.

dern Writers are wont to produce from it. I look on this Doctrine as one of those that could never be discovered but by an extraordinary *Revelation*. Should God be pleas'd to ask me, as he did the Prophet, *Son of Man*, can these dry Bones live? I can only appeal to him for the truth of it, and must humbly answer in the Prophet's Words, *Lord God, thou knowest*.

I shall conclude this Argument with a
Act 3. 21. Testimony of (a) *St. Peter*, which confirms the Notion which we have advanc'd. He affirms, That the Resurrection was foretold by the Prophets from the very beginning of the World. *The Heavens* (says he) *must receive Christ untill the time of the Restitution of all things: Of which God hath spoken by the Mouth of his Holy Prophets, ἀπ' αἰῶνος, since the World began, or, from the beginning of the World.*

These Traditions preserv'd among the *Heathens*, I have placed here in the first Station, as an *Out-guard* upon my *Main Force*, the Authorities of Scripture which contains the same Tradition of the Resurrection derived down first from *Noah*, and again confirmed and ratified anew by other *Revelations*. I shall now in the next place draw this out, and give you a full view of it.

I begin with the Testimonies of the Old Testament, and the Common Opinion of the ancient *Jews*. 'Tis confidently asserted by (a) *Menasseh Ben Israel*, (a) De Resur. initia Epistola Dedic. that the *Doctrine of the Resurrection* was *always* so receiv'd by the *Ancient Jews*, as that any one that denied it was rejected out of ~~the~~ *number* of the *Israelites*. But this is an Assertion which I cannot undertake to defend: On the contrary, it must be confess'd that among the *Ancient Jews* there were many that did not acknowledge it, who were lookt upon nevertheless as *true Israelites*. 'Twill be worth our while to enquire into this matter, and the love of Truth, which has all along been, and, I hope, will always be my Guide, obliges me to do it. I shall shew,

1. That it was not *always* receiv'd among the *Jews* as a necessary Article of Faith, or term of Communion, and who they were that did not acknowledge it.

2. That tho' there were some amongst 'em that did not acknowledge it, and it was not *always* lookt upon as a necessary Article of Faith, yet it was the *common* and receiv'd Opinion of that Nation about the time of our Saviour, as well *before* as *after*.

3. That the Doctrine of the *Immortality of the Soul* was not receiv'd among the *Jews* of those times, as a necessary Article of Faith, or Term of Communion: From whence it follows, that the Doctrine of the *Resurrection* is not therefore the less certain, because it was not always lookt upon by the *Jews* as a necessary Article of Faith.

4. I shall shew that the Doctrine of the Resurrection is plainly alluded to in the Prophecies of the *Old Testament*, and by them confirm'd.

First, That the Doctrine of the Resurrection was not *always* receiv'd among the *Jews* as a necessary Article of Faith, or Term of Communion, will appear from *some* of the following Examples of such as did not acknowledge it.

1. The *Essens*, a famous Sect among the *Jews*, consisting of no less than about * 4000 in number. That they did not acknowledge a Resurrection, nor the re-union of the Soul with any kind of Body, may be easily gather'd from that account which *Josephus* gives us of their Doctrines concerning the Soul. In his Second (a) Book of the *Jewish War*, where he speaks very largely of 'em, having taken an occasion to speak of their being tormented by some of the

* *Philo*
Jud. Quod
omnis
probus
sic liber.
p. 678.

(a) C. 7.
p. 789.

the Roman Soldiers; In the midst (says he) of their sufferings they smil'd, and laughing at them that inflicted their Torments, they gave up their Souls with a great deal of Constancy and Chearfulness, as Men that expected to * recover 'em again. This last Expression may seem to intimate that they expected that their Souls would be again united to their Bodies, but from that which follows it appears that our Author's meaning was otherwise. For they have (says he) a most certain Opinion amongst 'em, that their Bodies indeed are corruptible, and that their Matter shall not be perpetual : but that their Souls shall always have a being ; that, coming from out of the subtle Ether, they are drawn down into their Bodies by a natural sort of Attraction, and there are detain'd as it were in Prisons : but when they are freed from the bonds of Flesh, as it were from a long Enslavement, with a great deal of Joy they flee away on high. And as for good Souls they agree with the Greeks, that they dwell beyond the Ocean, in a perfect enjoyment of Happiness in a Country free from all kind of Grievance, from Showers, Snows, and Heats, made infinitely pleasant by the Western Gales arising out of the Ocean. But as for the Souls of the Wicked, they are sent into certain Places expos'd to Cold and Tempests, there

* Εὐθυμοί
τοὶ ψυχῆς
ἐπιστάντες
πάλιν κο-
μίζονται.

to remain in everlasting Misery and Torment. *Josephus* (a) tells us, that in his Youth he had made it his Business to enquire into the Doctrines of the Particular Sects, the *Essens*, the *Sadduces*, and the *Pharisees*, and to learn their Customs and Ways of living, being conversant amongst 'em with great perseverance and application, that having inform'd himself of their several Rules and Placits, he might adhere to that Sect which should please him best. It is therefore evident that he could not be ignorant of the true Opinion of the *Essens*: And this we must of necessity grant, that those *Essens* at least with whom he had Convers'd, profess'd the aforesaid Opinion. It is not enough to say that *Josephus* was a Court-Writer, and likely to misrepresent their Opinions that they might seem to agree with the *Greeks* and *Romans*, among whom he liv'd: For that the aforesaid Opinion might be really the Opinion of the *Essens*, will appear very probable from the next Example, which is that of *Philo Judæus*.

Secondly, That *Philo*, the famous Jew, who liv'd in the Time of the Apostles, and is call'd by his Country-Man *Josephus* (a) a Man every way Glorious, and was in his own Time so highly esteem'd by the Jews

(a) ὁ ἅγιος
τοῦ πάλαιου
Ἰσραὴλ
Antiq. l. 18.
c. 10.

Jews of Alexandria, where he liv'd, as to be sent their chief Embassador to *Rome*, to defend their Cause against their Enemies; that he did not own the Resurrection of the Body, or that the Soul is hereafter to be united for ever to another Body, is from many places of his Works undeniably evident. It is certain that according to the Doctrine of *Plato*, he look'd on the *Body* as the *Prison* of the *Soul*, and he expressly asserts, that the purer Sorts of Souls do fly from the *Body* as their *Gaol*, and live for ever in a State of Separation. If on any account it be true what was commonly said of him by the *Greeks*, it is chiefly so in relation to the Soul, (a) Either *Plato* Philonizes or *Philo* Platonizes, either *Plato* learn'd his Philosophy of the *Jews*, or else *Philo* was a Follower of *Plato*. The last is the truth. Let us hear now what *Philo* says. In his Book (b) *Concerning Dreams*, his Philosophy is this ~~That~~ *the Air between the surface of the Earth and the Concave of the Moon, is the place of the Habitation of Souls, which are there innumerable: Of these there are some which descend to be join'd and united to mortal Bodies, as many as are nearer to the Earth, and desirous of union with 'em. After the time of separation assign'd by Nature, and their return again*

(a) *St. Hieron. Catalog. Photius Cod. 103.*

(b) *P. 455. Edit. Colon. 1613*

gain up into the Air, there are some still retain a desire of Life and re-union, and these are again united to a Body (by a *παλιγγενεσία* or *μετεμψύχως*.) but others are weary of the vanity of Life, and flee from the Body as a Grave or a Prison, and nimbly flying into the upper Regions of the Ether, there fix their Abode and Habitation.

(a) P. 459. ther (a) place of the same Book, having cited those Words which God spake to

(b) Gen.
28. 15.

Jacob in his Dream: (b) And behold I am with thee, and will keep thee in all places whither thou goest, and will bring thee again into this Land: For I will not leave thee until I have done that which I have spoken to thee of: On those Words, And I will bring thee again into this Land, according to his allegorizing way, he thus Comments: This Place (says he) is perhaps to be understood of the Immortality of the Soul; for the Soul having left its Heavenly Place, and Travelling into the Body, the Father promises it, that he will not always suffer it to be held in Prison, but will free it from its Bonds, and bring it into its ancient Country, neither will he cease to keep it till his Promise be perfectly fulfill'd. And agreeably to this

(c) De Gi-
gantibus,
p. 222.

in another (c) Book he says, that of the Souls which are dwelling in the Air, some are Angels, and others descending into the
Body,

Body, as it were into a River, are sometimes overwhelm'd in its rapid Gulphs, and sometimes bearing briskly up against 'em do first swim out, and then fly back to the place from whence they came. These (says he) are the Souls of those who are taught some Philosophy from on high, which continually from the Beginning to the End desire the dissolution of that Life which is by conjunction with the Body, that they may obtain an Incorporeal and an Incorruptible Life, with the Unbegotten and Incorruptible (God.) But those which are drown'd, are the Souls of other Men; who neglecting Wisdom, give themselves up to the uncertain blasts of Fortune, which do not appertain to our better Part, but only to our Bodies, or else to such Things as are voider than they of Life, such as Glory, and Riches, and Power, and Honour, and those other things which Men, that look not on that which is truly Good, do fancy and paint to themselves by false and erroneous Notions.

Thirdly, That many of the Jews who held the Immortality of the Soul, did not own the Resurrection of the Body, may be further gather'd from a place of Cornelius Tacitus (a) the Roman Historian, ^{(a) Hist.} where he describes the Customs of that ^{L. 5. c. 3.} Nation. He says thus of 'em in general: *Animasque prælio aut suppliciiis per-*

em-

emptorum, eternas putant. They believe that the Souls of such (Jews) as are slain in Battle, or put to Death (by the Enemies of their Religion) are immortal. Tho' he speaks in the same Place of their Custom of burying their dead Bodies (contrary to that of the Romans, who were wont to burn their Dead) yet he speaks not a Word of their believing the Resurrection of those Bodies. Which he could not have omitted, if he had known that they believ'd it, it being so singular and extraordinary a Thing; and he could not (one would think) have been ignorant of it, if the Jews had so generally held it as they did the Immortality of the Soul.

*Fourthly, There were among the ancient Jews certain natural Philosophers, whom the Rabbins are wont to call Sapientes Mecar, from their searching or enquiring after natural Causes : To which appellation St. Paul the Apostle seems to have had Respect in those Words to the Corinthians (a) : Where is the Wise ? Where is the Scribe ? Where is the Searcher (or Enquirer, the συζητητής, which we in our Translation render the Disputer) of this World. So St. Jerom indeed has render'd it * Ubi enim Sapiens ? Ubi Grammaticus ? Ubi causarum Naturalium Scrutator.*

(a) Epist.
1. Cor. 1. v. 20.

(*) Proam.
in l. 3.
Com. ad
Galatas.

Scrutatores ? Of them its affirm'd by * *Vide*
 * one of the learned *Rabbins*, that they *Drusii Ob-*
 denied the existence of *Demons*, and *serv. l. 4.*
 that *some of them asserted that all li-*
ving Things (not only *Men*, but all o-
 ther *Animals*) *shall after Death rise again,*
their Souls returning into other Bodies af-
ter a certain space of many Thousands of
Years. This Opinion concerning the *Revo-*
lution of Souls they borrow'd of the *Hea-*
thens, and tho' it were originally ground-
 ed on a Tradition concerning the *Resur-*
rection, yet the Doctrine is not the same.

Fifthly, Another Sect that denied the
Resurrection was that of the *Sadduces*.
 That they denied it I need not endea-
 vour to prove. I shall only here tell
 ye, that tho' they did so, yet in the
 Time of our Saviour and his Apostles,
 they were not look'd upon as *Hereticks*
 by the *Jews*, but were properly Mem-
 bers of their Body and Communion.
 This I shall prove by and by.

Sixthly, There was another Sect of the
Jews call'd *Hemero-Baptists*, who agreed,
 as *Epiphanius* assures us, with the *Sadduces*
 in denying the *Resurrection*, and in their
 other Tenets; only in this they dissent-
 ed from 'em, that they esteem'd it ne-
 cessary, for the cleansing themselves from
 Sin, to bathe themselves every Day, both
 Winter

Winter and Summer : From whence they had their Name.

Seventhly, That the Prophet *Ezekiel* himself did not fully rely on the Doctrine of a future *Resurrection*, but doubted once a little of it, as a Doctrine at that time not sufficiently reveal'd, or almost forgotten, may be gathered from the Answer which he return'd to that Question of God Almighty, *Son of Man, can these (dry) Bones live?* If the Doctrine of the Resurrection had been at that time the common and receiv'd Doctrine, as it was afterwards in the time of our Saviour, and the Prophet had been fully assur'd of it, he would not have answer'd, as he did; *Lord God, Thou knowest*: But roundly, as *Martha* answer'd our Saviour concerning the Resurrection of her Brother *Lazarus*, *I know, Lord, that they can and will*. 'Tis true, the Words, *thou knowest* are capable of another interpretation, and may be so understood as to signifie, *thou knowest that they can*. But the true meaning seems to be otherwise, and they seem to import thus much: *Thou knowest whether they can or no; I do not*.

Eighthly, To these we may add the *Samaritans*, who tho' they were not of the Communion of the *Jews*, were however the

the Followers of the Law of *Moses*. If we may believe some of those ancient Writers, who have given an account of their Opinions, they were not only ignorant of the Doctrine of the *Resurrection*, but rejected likewise that of the Immortality of the Soul. This is positively asserted by (a) *Leontius*, and long before him by (b) *Origen*. But it does not seem to be true: For in the *Chronicon Samaritanum* they expressly own the Immortality of the Soul, and Rewards and Punishments in the next Life;

and it's plainly intimated by

(c) *St. Cyril Bishop of Jerusalem*, that they did not deny the Immortality of the Soul, but only doubted of it. But tho' they did not deny the Immortality of the Soul, yet certain it is, that they deny'd

the *Resurrection* of the Body. In this all Au-

thors agree with *Origen* and *Leontius* a-

bove-cited, as *St. Cyril* (a), *Epiphanius*, the

Author of the (b) *Recognitions* ascrib'd

to *St. Clement*, and the (c) *Talmudists*.

Secondly, tho' the Doctrine of

the *Resurrection* was not always receiv'd

by the *Jews* as a necessary Article

of Faith, or Term of Communion,

as appears from some of the foregoing

Instances,

(c) *Catech.* 18. 'Αλλ' ἀνελίγουσιν πρὸς τὸ τοῦ ἀδελφῶν οἱ ἀγνοῦσι Σαμαρεῖς, καὶ φασι ὅτι τὰς μὲν ψυχὰς ἐγχαίρει μὲνιν καὶ Ἀβραάμ, καὶ Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ Ἰακώβ. Τὰ δὲ σώματα ἀναστῆναι οὐ δύναται, p. 215.

(a) *De Sectis*, Añ. 2.
(b) *Com. in Mat.* p. 486.

(a) *Her.* 4.
(b) *L.* 1.
c. 54.
(c) *Tract.* Sanhedrin, c. 11. § 3.

Instances, yet 'tis certain that about the time of our Saviour, as well before as after, it was the *receiv'd* and *common* Doctrine of that Nation. This evidently appears from the following Examples.

1. In the Answers which the *Seven* Martyrs give their Tormenters, which we read recorded in the Second Book of *Maccabees*, there's a clear and open Profession of this Doctrine: And it plainly appears from the Answer of the Third of those Martyrs, that the Resurrection which they expected was of the *same Humane* Body. Being call'd to his Torments, and holding out his hands, (a) *These I had* (says he) *from Heaven, and for his Laws I despise 'em, and from him I hope to receive 'em again.* This happen'd about 165 Years before Christ. 'Tis true, I am not fully perswaded that these Words were really spoken by that Martyr. Since there were not any *Jews* then present who might think it worth their while to commit the Words of those several Martyrs to Memory, it may be reasonably suppos'd that the Speeches ascrib'd to 'em were made by the Author of the History, as is usual with other Historians. Thus *Josephus* in his History of those Martyrs makes 'em speak quite different Speeches; so likewise the
Arabick

(a) C. 7.
v. 11.

Arabick History which is extant in the *Polyglot Bible*, and (if I well remember) the Hebrew *Ben Gorion*; all differing both from the Book of *Maccabees*, and from one another. Yet this at least is to be concluded from these Words, that when the Second of *Maccabees* was written, this Doctrine was generally receiv'd, and 'twas also then taken for granted, that at that time when those Martyrs suffer'd, it was the general and receiv'd Doctrine. How ancient that Book is, we do not certainly know, but we know from *Clemens Alexandrinus*, who cites it, that it was extant within 150 Years after our Saviour's Passion; and from the First and Second Chapters it may easily be gather'd, that it was written long before his *Nativity*, before the *Jews* were conquer'd by the *Romans*.

2. We read in the same (a) Book, (a) C. 14. that *Razis* the Jew, when he pluck'd v. 46. out his own *Bowels*, and cast 'em with his Hands upon the Throng, call'd upon the Lord of Life and Spirit to restore him those again.

3. (b) I know that he shall rise again (b) St. 1 in the Resurrection at the last day. Thus Jo. 11. 24. Martha concerning her Brother *Lazarus*, when our Saviour had told her that, tho' he then lay dead and buried, yet he
F should

should *rise again*. She ~~knows~~ it, she says, and does not at all doubt of it.

4. That it was the common and receiv'd Opinion of the *Jews* at that time, that the Body in the Resurrection would be truly a *Humane* Body, is farther evident from that Question of the *Sadducees* concerning the Woman that had

(a) *Mat.* 22. 28. *Whose Wife she should be in the Resur-*
Mark 12. *rection?*
Luke 23. 20. 32.

5. It's evident likewise from that Saying of one of the *Jews* at the Feast where Christ was present in the House of one of the chief *Pharisees*. When Christ had told the *Pharisee* that if he invited the *Poor*, &c. *he should be recompens'd at the Resurrection of the Just*; one of those that sat at Meat with him

(b) *Luke* 14. 14. made him this Answer, (b) *Blessed is he that shall eat Bread in the Kingdom of God*. Their Opinion was, that they should *Eat* and *Drink* in the next Life as well as in this.

6. *Josephus*, the learned *Jew*, who was born in the Thirty Seventh Year after Christ, professes himself a Follower of the *Pharisees*; and in another place he tells us (the place I shall produce hereafter) that the *Pharisees* own'd a Transmigration of the Soul out of one Body into

into another: It should therefore seem that he himself also held it. But it is not necessary that because he chose rather to adhere to the Sect of the *Pharisees*, than to that of the *Essens* or *Sadduces*, he should therefore be in *all things* a *Pharisee*.

In his Third * Book of the *War*, he seems to intimate that the Souls of the *Wicked* shall not after Death be re-conjoin'd to a Body, but he plainly asserts that those of the *Good* shall. And from this consideration he endeavours to dissuade his Companions from laying violent Hands upon themselves. *Such Souls*

(says he) *as are pure and obedient, obtain the most Holy place of Heaven, whence after the great Revolution of the World, (or, after the circumvolution of many Ages,) they shall return, and again inhabit Chast Bodies. But they who lay violent Hands upon themselves, their Souls are cast into Hell, and God punishes their Sin in their Posterity.* Whether he held the *Resurrection*, or only the *Transmigration of the Soul*, we cannot from this place certainly conclude. But from another place of his Works, (if he were the true Author of the

* C. 25. (Græc.) Καθαροὶ δὲ ἱπποὶ μένουσιν αἱ ψυχαι, καὶ ἐν ἑαυτῷ λαχούσιν τὸ ἀγιώτατον, ἔσθην ἐν αὐτοῖς αἰώνων ἀγνοοῖς πάντων ἀνθρώπων (ὅν) σωμασάν· ὅσοις δὲ καὶ ἑαυτῶν ἐμάκρυνον αἱ χεῖρες, τῶν μὲν ἄλλης διὰ τὰς ψυχὰς σκοποῦνται, ὁ δὲ τῶν πατρὶς Θεοῦ εἰς ἐκτόνους μεταπέμψῃ τοὺς θεάσαντες ὑπερταῖς.

Book call'd *Maccabaica*) it appears very evidently that he own'd the *Resurrexi-*
on. For he cites there that
 place of the Prophet *Ezechi-*
el (a) where he speaks, of
 the raising up of the *dry Bones*.
 He tells us that the *Macca-*
bees were encouraged by
 their Mother with the hopes
 and assurance of a future Life.

(a) *Ad finem.* Ἐδὲ α-
 ζε ὁ ἱερογλυφικὸς πα-
 ραμύαζεν ἡμῖν λέγοντα
 εὐλογεῖν τὸν θεὸν πάντες τοῖς
 πνεύματι αὐτοῦ τὸ θέλημα.
 Τὸν ἱερογλυφικὸν παρ-
 αμύαζεν εἰς τὸν θεόν
 λέγοντα· εἰ ζήσιν τὰ
 ὅσα, τὰ ἐνεστῶτα ταῦτα, &c.

She propos'd (says he) *to her Sons the Say-*
ing of Solomon, That God is the Wood
of Life to them that do his Will: And that
of Ezechiel: Can these dry Bones live?
Neither did she omit that Saying of Moses in
his Song: I will kill, and I will make alive.
 And from hence it likewise appears, that
Josephus believ'd, that at that time when
 those Martyrs suffer'd, the Doctrine of
 the Resurrection of the *same Humane Bo-*
dy was the common and establish'd Do-
 ctrine. And that this was the common
 Opinion in his time, may be further ga-
 ther'd from what he says concerning the
 Opinion of the Sect of the *Essens*, That
 they had a most certain Opinion amongst
 'em, that *their Bodies indeed were cor-*
ruptible, and that their Matter should not
be perpetual. This had been a very idle
 Observation, if some others had not as-
 serted the *Perpetuity of the Body* as well
 as

as of the Soul. He therefore takes notice of that Opinion of theirs, because it was contrary to the *receiv'd* and *general* Opinion.

7. In the *Targum*, or *Chaldee Paraphrase* of *Jonathan*, who is placed by some in the same Age with the Apostles, there is mention made of the *Second Death* in Hell, and that too of the *Body*. For thus he paraphrases the *Sixth Verse* of the *Sixty Fifth Chapter* of *Isaiah*; *Their Vengeance shall be in Hell, where the Fire continually burns. Behold it is written before me; I will not give 'em an end in this Life, but will be revenged on'em for their Sins, and deliver their Bodies to the Second Death.* And here I shall observe by the bye, That tho' *Josephus* seems to intimate that the *Wicked* are not to rise; and many of the *Rabbins* affirm the same thing: Yet from hence it is manifest, that among the *Ancient Jews*, there were others of the contrary Perswasion. And that in the time of the Apostles this was the general and receiv'd Opinion of the *Jews*, is apparent from those Words of *St. Paul* in his *Apology to Felix* (a): *But this I* ^(a) *also* *confess unto thee, that I have Hope to-* ^{24. 15.} *wards God, which they themselves (the Jews) also allow, that there shall be a Re-*

ſurrection of the Dead, both of the Juſt and Unjuſt.

8. The *Chaldee Paraphraſe of the Canticles* has theſe Words, C. 8. V. 5. The Prophet Salomon ſaid, *When the Dead ſhall revive, it ſhall come to paſs that the Mount of Olives ſhall be cleft, and all the Dead of Iſrael ſhall come out from thence: And the Juſt too that died in Captivity ſhall come through the way of the Caverns under the Earth, and ſhall come forth out of the Mount of Olives.* It aſſerts that famous Opinion, that the Jews that die out of *Judea*, when they riſe from the Dead, are to paſs through the *Caverns of the Earth* ſo far as *Judea*, and are there to riſe. This ſhews that they believ'd the Reſurrection of the ſame *Humane Body*. This *Devolution of the Dead*, or *Rowling of the Caverns* (aſthey are wont to call it) is aſſerted by many of the Ancient *Rabbins*, and particularly in both their (a) *Talmuds*. And tho' ſome of the Moderns, as *Menaffe Ben-Iſrael*, and ſeveral others, reject it, and are willing that what the Ancients ſay concerning it, ſhould be taken not literally, but in an Allegorical ſenſe, yet 'twas certainly the Opinion of many amongſt 'em. And even at this Day there are many that acknowledge it. And that (as they tell

(a) Vide
Menaffe
Ben-Iſrael
de Reſur.
l. 2. c. 2.
Vorſtii Ani-
mad, in
Pirke R.
Elieſer, p.
216.
Pocockii
Notas in
Portam
Moſis,
p. 119.

tell us) was the reason why *Jacob* and *Joseph* who died in *Egypt*, were carried into *Canaan* to be buried there, that they might not be obnoxious to the trouble of the *Caverns*. Hence it is that the Bones of so many *Jews*, who die in foreign Countries, are carried by their Friends into *Judæa*. We are told by a

(a) Traveller of our own, that *in what* (a) John Sanderson Voyage to the Holy Land.

part soever they die, and are buried, their Bodies must all rise to Judgment in the Holy Land, out of the Valley of Jehosaphat, and that therefore the greater and richer sort of 'em, have their Bones convey'd to some part thereof by their Kindred or Friends. By which means (says he) they are freed of a labour to scrape thither through the Ground, which with their Nails they hold they must, who are not there buried, or convey'd thither by others.

(b) Another assures us, that *whole Barks full* (b) Sanda's Travels, p. 148.

of Jews Bones are wont to arrive at Joppa to be interr'd at Jerusalem. The reason he gives is this, Because they imagine that the Soul is delighted by it, and at the general Judgment, they shall have a quicker dispatch. The same reason is given by (a) others. And by

(b) *Thevenot* we are told, that the *Jews* (a) Morison's Trav. p. 223. (b) Travels, p. 184.

who now live in Jerusalem, give a Chequin

a Day for permission to bury their Dead

in the Valley of Jehosaphat, that they may be the sooner dispatch'd at the Day of Judgment, because, as they believe, it will be held in that place. They think that they who are there buried will be sooner dispatch'd, because they are the first that will make their Appearance, it requiring some time for those who are buried elsewhere, to come thither.

(a) *Tracl. Sanhedrin.*
c. 11.
§. 1.

(b) *Ibid.*
§. 4.

(c) *In Pirke* c. 33.
(d) *L. c.*

9. The (a) *Talmudical* Doctors declare, that to deny the *Resurrection* is so great a Sin, that they who deny it shall never rise. They tell us, (b) that *Cleopatra*, Queen of *Egypt*, believ'd the *Resurrection*, and that she propos'd *R. Meir* this Question, Whether they that rise, shall rise *Naked*, or with *Cloths* on? *R. Meir* affirms, that they shall rise with their *Cloths* on, the same in which they were buried. And the same is asserted by another very ancient Doctor, (c) *R. Eliezer*. The (d) *Talmudists* add, that one of the *Roman* Emperors objecting to *R. Gamaliel* the difficulty of the *Resurrection* of a Body reduced to *Dust*, a Daughter of the Rabbi undertook to give him an Answer, to this purpose: *There are with us* (says she) *two Potters*; one makes *Vessels* of *Water*, the other of *Clay*; Which of them is the best? He that makes 'em of *Water*, says she, *Emperor*: Then she: *Did God*
make

make Man out of Water, and shall he not much more be able to make him of Clay? (a) (a) L.c.
 That a certain Heretick (or Sadduce) objecting the same difficulty to R. Ammin, he return'd him an Answer by this Parable: A certain King (says he) commanded his Servants to build him a Palace in a Place, where there was neither Water nor Earth, for Mortar. It was done. That falling down, he commanded it to be built in a Place where there was good store of both. They tell him, that they cannot do it. He in Anger replies: What, when there was neither Water nor Earth for Mortar, you could build one; and now you have both, can you not do it? If thou believest not (says R. Gamaliel) get thee into the Field, and see there a Mouſe, which to day is partly Fleſh and partly Earth, but to Morrow by a quick and sudden Generation is become all Fleſh. Perhaps thou may'st say, that that is done in some ſpace of Time. Go therefore out upon the Hill, thou ſhalt there ſee at preſent, but only one Snail: To Morrow when it has rain'd, thou ſhalt ſee the whole Hill cover'd with Snails. (a) (b) L.c.
 That one ſaying to Gebiha Ben-Peſiſa, Woe to you, ye Villains, that ſay, that the Dead ſhall live. What, do the Living die, and ſhall the Dead live? He answer'd; Woe to you, ye wicked Wretches, that deny
 that

that the Dead shall live. Since they, who once were not did afterwards exist, shall not they much more exist, who once had a being before ? Thus the ancient Doctors in the Gemara.

(a) Ap.
Pocockii
Portam
Mosis, p.
177.

10. Of the 13 Articles or Foundations of Faith collected by (a) Maimonides, and receiv'd by the whole Nation of the Jews long before his time, the last is this: That there will be a Resurrection of the Dead. And Maimonides tells us that whoever denied any one of those Articles, he is rejected out of the Number of the Israelites, and is branded with the Name of Heretick, and Epicurean, and ought to be destroy'd. In the Office of Mourners, which is extant in the Jews Common-Prayer-Book Entitled, *The Mahzor of the holy Roman Synagogue*, they are directed, when they look upon the Graves of any of their Nation, to offer up this Prayer: *Blessed be the Lord our God, the King of the World, who form'd you with judgment, nourish'd you, preserv'd you alive, deliver'd you up unto Death: who knows the Number of you all, who will raise you up again, who will restore you again with Judgment. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who givest Life to the Dead.* † *May thy Dead live, with my dead Body may they rise again. Awake and rejoice ye that lie in the Dust, because*
the

† Isai. 26.
19.

*the (a) Dew of the Light is your Dew, (a) De Ro-
and the Earth shall cast out the Dead. re quo futu-
rum est*

The same Prayer, or Benediction, is pronounced likewise by the *Hazan*, or Minister of the Synagogue, at the Grave of one to be buried. In the Prayer which is sung at the Grave by the *Hazan*, together with the rest of the Congregation, (which they call *the justification of Judgment*) they have these Words: *God is*

*juxta Rab-
binos ut
Dew vita
restituat
mortuos.
Vide Po-
cock. in
Perram
Mosis, p.
120.*

*perfect in all his Works. Who will say
unto him, What dost thou? He who governs
in Things beneath, and in Things above,
who delivers up to Death, who gives Life,
who brings down to the Grave, and brings
back again. To which they add those
out of Moses's Song in (b) Deuteronomy. (b) C. 32.*

*See now that I, even I, am he, and there
is no God with me. I kill, and I make a-
live. I wound and I heal. Neither is
there any that can deliver out of my Hand.*

v. 37.

After the dead Body is put into the Grave, they bow themselves backward three times, and throw Grass over their Heads, signifying their hope of the Resurrection with these Words, out of *Isaiab*, *And your Bones shall bud as the Grass*. After that, in the Porch of the Synagogue; God shall destroy Death for ever, and wipe away all Tears from their Eyes, and will take away their Reproach
from

from all the Earth, for the Lord hath spoken it.

If I had a mind to transcribe the Observations of (a) others, I could add to these, the Testimonies of 500 other *Rabbinical* Writers, but I content my-self to have presented you with my own Observations. And from what has been laid before you it abundantly appears, *First*, That the Doctrine of the Resurrection has been lookt upon by the *Jews* as a necessary Article of their *Creed*, from before the Date of their *Talmuds*. *Secondly*, That tho' it was not receiv'd by 'em as an indispensible Article of Faith in the time of our Saviour, and for some time before and after, yet even in those times it was the common and receiv'd Doctrine. *Thirdly*, That by the *Resurrection* they always understood, not barely the re-conjunction of the Soul with a Body after Death, but the resuscitation of the *same Humane* Body. I shall only add that the *Resurrection* is acknowledged not only by the *Rabbinists* or the Followers of the *Talmud*, which are much the greater Number, but also by those that are call'd *Karraites*, who follow only the Scripture, disallowing Traditions, and are therefore reckon'd by the *Talmudists* as Hereticks. These are said to be

(a) Vide
not. Pococ-
kii in Por-
tam Aegypti,
p. 86. ad
234. Et
Menasseh
Ben-Israel
per totum
opus de Re-
surrectio-
ne.

be descended from the ancient *Sadduces*. If so, it appears, that the *Sadduces* themselves were at last convinced of their Error, and made Proselytes to the Doctrine of the *Resurrection*.

'Twas about the end of the first Century after our Saviour's Nativity, that the Doctrine of the *Resurrection* began to be reckon'd among the *Jews*, as a necessary Article of Faith. I gather it thus. That it was not an Article of Faith till after the time of *Josephus*, who liv'd till near the end of that Century appears from hence, that neither the *Essens*, nor the *Sadduces*, were in his time accounted *Hereticks*. And that it was receiv'd as a part of their Creed before the Year 140, appears from what we read in *Justin Martyr's* Dialogue with *Trypho*, p. 306, 307. It appears from thence that the Doctrine of the *Resurrection*, and that too of the *same Humane Body*, was at that time acknowledged by all such *Jews* as were accounted *Orthodox*, and that the *Sadduces*, who denied it, were at that time rejected as *Hereticks*.

I should here (*Philaethes*) have dismiss'd this Point, but it comes now into my Mind, that there are two things relating to the Opinion of the *Jews*, of which you desire particularly to be satisfied,

tified, which ought to be consider'd in this Place. Your Queries are concerning the Transmigration of Souls out of one Body into another by a *παλγγοεσία*, Whether that be not held by many of the *Jews*? and if so, Whether they, that hold it, do not deny the Resurrection of the Body? How that Opinion can be consistent with this?

To the First of these Queries I must answer in the Affirmative. It is very true, that the Transmigration of Souls out of one Body into another, is by many of the *Jews*, both ancient and modern, maintain'd. They call it *The Revolution of Souls*, or *The secret of the Revolution*. *Leo Modena* speaks of it as of a common Opinion, but he adds withal, that there are *many* that do not believe it. And the Author (b) of *The Present State of the Jews in Barbary*, takes notice of it as receiv'd by the *Jews* of those Parts. Another Traveller observes that it's likewise receiv'd among the *Jews* of *Asia*. Of the learned *Jews* that assert it *Monnasseh Ben-Israel* is one, and the famous *Abarbinel* another. It's likewise asserted by the ancient *Cabbalists* in the *Zoar*, and by the (c) *Talmudists* themselves. The *Cabbalists* tell us, that the Soul of *Adam*, *David*, and the *Messias*, is one and the same.

(b) Dr.
Addison.

(c) Vide
Hornbeckium de
conversione
Judaicis.
p. 541. ad
350. *Mon-*
nasseh Ben-
Isr. de Re-
surrectione. l. c.

same. We are told by others, that (a) ^{(a) Vide Seld. de Succes. Pont. p. 111, 112.} *Phineas*, the Grand-Son of *Aaron*, and *Elias* the Prophet were the same Man : By which they must mean, either that the Soul of *Phineas* pass'd into the Body of *Elias*, or that *Phineas* did not die, but that having lain hid for many Ages, or having been translated, he afterwards appear'd again, and was call'd *Elias*. It may seem more probable, that they believ'd the first, and it's generally taken for granted by learned Men that they did so : Yet I cannot be confident of it : for I find that some of the *Rabbins* (b) ^{(b) Vid. Seld. l. c. p. 109.} had this Tradition and Opinion amongst 'em, that *Phineas* liv'd many Ages.

The Reason they give for the Transmigration of Souls, is the same with that which is generally assign'd by the Heathens, viz. That the Soul may be purg'd and amended. But they do not hold, as the Heathens did, that the Soul Transmigrates into many Bodies. They restrain it to *Three*. Thus the Soul of *Adam* (they will tell ye) was purg'd by passing into the Body of *K. David*, and by passing again into the Body of the *Messias*, will be fully and perfectly purified. A modern * Traveller tells us that * ^{John Sanderfon Trav. to Palestine.} John Sanderfon Trav. to Palestine. this was the Opinion of certain *Jews* of *Asia*, with whom he convers'd ; that the *Soul*,

Soul, if it has not at first forgiveness, is twice more sent into a Body to amend and become better, and then is rejected or receiv'd by God according to its Deserts. That the Soul is to pass into Three several Bodies, they prove from those Words of Job: † *Lo, all these things worketh God thrice* (which we render, oftentimes) *with Man*. And of the Transmigration they understand the Chaldee Paraphrase of Isaiah, Chap. 22. v. 14. where mention is made of the * *second Death*.

† C. 33.
v. 29.

* The Paraphrase means Damnation, as appears, C. 65. v. 6.

Neither is it only the Transmigration of the Soul into other Human Bodies that is own'd and receiv'd among the Jews. There are some amongst 'em, that, like thorough-pac'd Pythagoreans, make it pass into the Bodies of Brutes. (a) Hol-

(a) Not. in
Poshyri
Vitam Py-
thagoræ,
p. 81.

stenius assures us that he himself had convers'd with some in Italy, that asserted it very zealously, and prov'd it from the Story of K. Nebuchadnezar, whose Soul they affirm'd to have really pass'd into the Body of a Beast. They prov'd it likewise from those Words of the Psalmist (b) *Deliver my Soul from the Sword, my Darling from the Power of the Dog*. Where the Prophet (say they) begs of God, that his Soul being loos'd from its Body, might not pass into a Dog, or any other Brute.

(b) Ps. 21.
v. 21.

It

It appears from the Testimony of *Josephus*, that the Opinion of the Transmigration of the Soul into another *Human* Body by a *παλιγγενεσία*, was receiv'd among the *Jews* even in his time, and that too by many of the *Pharisees* themselves. In his *Second Book concerning the Jewish War*, where he gives us a particular account of the *Dogma's* of the several Sects among the *Jews*, he affirms of the *Pharisees* (in general) that they held (a) That all Souls

are immortal, That those only of good Men pass into another Body, but those of bad Men are eternally punished. And agree-

ably to this, in the Eighteenth

Book of his *Antiquities*, where he likewise gives an account of the Opinions

of the several Sects, (b) The *Pharisees* (says he) believe that the Souls of Men, both Good and Bad, are immortal, That they have judgment pass'd upon 'em under the ground, according to their behaviour in this Life, and that those of bad Men are retain'd in perpetual imprisonment ; but to those of the good there is

given the power of returning to Life. From the words of *Philo Judæus*, which

(a) C. 7. p. 783. Ψυ-
χὴν ὃ παῖσαν μὲ ἀθάνατον,
μεταβαίνειν ὃ εἰς ἑτέραν
σῶμα, καὶ μὲ ἀγαθῶν μί-
νην καὶ ὃ κατὰ καλῶν, αἰ-
δίον πρῶτα καλεῖται.

(b) C. 2. p. 617. Ἄ-
θανάτον τιχὺν ταῖς
ψυχαῖς τίς τις αὐτοῖς ἰδὲ,
καὶ ὑποχθονὲς δικασθεὶς
καὶ πάλιν οἷς ἀρετῆς ἢ
κακίας ὁππότεναι ἐν τῷ
βίῳ γένηται καὶ ταῖς μὲ,
εἰργμένον αἰδίων τετιθε-
σθαι, ταῖς ὃ βλαπτομένη καὶ
ἀναβιβῶν.

I but now produced, it appears that he likewise acknowledg'd it.

'Tis believ'd by some learned Men, that this Opinion of the *Transanimation* was commonly receiv'd, even in the time of our Saviour, among the *Jews*. But I am rather of Opinion, That this part of the *Platonical* Philosophy began to be receiv'd just after our Saviour's time, and that *Pbilo*, and those *Pharisees* with whom *Josephus* had convers'd, were the first that taught it. That it was not known to the *Jews* in the time of our Saviour, I gather from the Answer which *Nicodemus*, the *Pharisee*, made him, when he had told him that no Man can see the Kingdom of God, except he be born again. A Man be born again! It seem'd to the *Pharisee* a very

* *John* 3.4. strange Saying. * How (says he) can a Man be born again? Can he enter the Second time into his Mother's Womb, and be born? Had the *παισχυρεσία*, whereof we discourse, been at that time known and acknowledged among the *Jews*, how could he who was a Master in *Israel* express so much wonder at the hearing of a *παισχυρεσία* mentioned? To this we may add, that there is not any Argument produced to shew, that this *Pythagorean παισχυρεσία* was receiv'd among

among the *Jews* in the time of our Saviour, but what is ineffectual, and grounded on a Mistake.

In the Gospel of † *St. Matthew*, it is † C. 16.]
said, that our Lord asking his Disciples, v. 14.

Whom do Men say, that I the Son of Man am? They told him, that some said he was *John the Baptist*, some *Elias*, and others *Jeremias*, or one of the Prophets.

In the Gospel of * *St. Mark* it is plain- * C. 8.
ly intimated, that the most common O- v. 27.]

pinion concerning him was, That he was *John the Baptist*. He askt his Disciples, *Whom do Men say that I am?* And they answer'd, *John the Baptist*. But some say *Elias*, and others, one of the Prophets.

This Opinion of the People concerning our Saviour, some learned Commentators, as *Munster*, *Maldonatus*, and *Druſus*, take to be grounded on the *Pythagorean* $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\mu\phi\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$, as if they imagin'd, that the Soul of *John the Baptist*, or of *Elias*, or some other of the Prophets, had entred into his Body in his Conception. But how could they imagine it of the Soul of *John the Baptist*, whom they knew to be just then put to Death? 'Tis very certain, that they who took him to be *John the Baptist*, believ'd that *John*, who was beheaded a little before, had risen again

out of his Grave. And that this was their Opinion, appears moreover from what † St. *Matth.* says of King *Herod*, that hearing of the fame of *Jesus*, he said unto his Servants, *This is John the Baptist; He is risen from the Dead, and therefore mighty Works do shew forth themselves in him.* St. *Luke* expressly asserts, that the People who took him to be *John the Baptist*, believ'd that the Baptist had risen from the Dead *: Now *Herod the Tetrarch* heard of all that was done by him: and he was perplexed, because it was said of some, that *John* was risen from the Dead: And of some that *Elias* had appeared: And of others that one of the old Prophets was risen again. As for those that thought him to be *Elias*, their Fancy was grounded on the expectation the Jews had of the coming of that Prophet again upon Earth, according to that of the Prophet *Malachi* †: *Behold I will send you Elias the Prophet.* They believ'd he would come again, not by a *παλιγγενεσία*, but in the same Body in which he was translated. When St. *Luke* says, that they thought *Elias* had appear'd, he plainly intimates, that they thought he had descended in his Body, not been born again.

It

† C. 14.
v. 2.

* C. 9:
v. 7, 8.

† C. 4.v.5.

It is said in † St. *John*, that the *Jews* † c. 1.
sent Priests and Levites from Jerusalem v. 21.
 to *John the Baptist*, to know who he was,
 whether *Christ*, or *Elias*, or that *Prophet*?
Grotius in his *Comment* on this place,
 believes, that when they askt him, whe-
 ther he was *Elias*? they imagin'd he
 might be *Elias* sent down from Hea-
 ven, but they (says he) that askt him that
Question, shew'd plainly that they did not
 know, of what *Father and Mother* he was
 born, or at least doubtd of it. But in a-
 nother place of his * *Comments* his Opi- * *St. Mat.*
 nion is otherwise. He proves from this 14. 2.
 place that the *Jews* before *Christ*, ac-
 knowledged a *παλιγγενεσία*; and from
 them he thinks that *Pythagoras* borrow'd
 his Opinion. That they could not think
John to be *Elias* any otherwise than by
 a *μετεμωμοσίως*, or *παλιγγενεσία*, he
 proves from this Consideration, that, he
 being of the *Sacerdotal Order*, they
 could not but know him very well.
 But to this I answer, that tho' he was
 of the *Sacerdotal Order*, yet he might
 very well be unknown to the *Jews* that
 then dwelt at *Jerusalem*. How could
 that be? † St. *Luke* will answer for me: † c. 1.
 From his Youth he was in the *Deserts*, 80.
 'till the day of his shewing unto *Israel*.

* *Drusius*,
Beza, *Pi-*
scator, &c.
 in Com-
 ment.

Another place from whence * some inferr, that the Transmigration of Souls was receiv'd among the *Jews* in those times, is *St. John ix. 2.* where we read that *Jesus passing by, and seeing a Man who was blind from his birth, his Disciples askt him saying; Master, who did sin, this Man or his Parents, that he was born blind?* But it is not necessary, that, because the Disciples believ'd that he sinned before he was born, they should therefore believe, that his Soul had been before that united to a Body. It is much more probable, that they thought his Soul might have sinned in its solitary state of *Pre-existence*, and was therefore sent down into such a Body. That this was their fancy, is agreed by most Commentators, *St. Cyril of Alexandria*, and *Grotius* himself; and it cannot be denied but that the Doctrine of the *Pre-existence* of the Soul was in those times receiv'd among the *Jews*. Sure I am, it is at this time their common and established Doctrine.

I mention'd but now certain *Natural Philosophers* among the *Jews*, who were call'd *Sapientes Mear*, and that there seem to have been some so call'd in the time of the Apostles. It is probable there were such even before those times.

It

It may seem from what I said of 'em, that *some* of 'em believ'd the *Pythagorean* *παλιγγενεσία*. But granting that *some* of 'em did so, yet it does not appear, that those that did so were some of the most ancient, such as lived in our Saviour's time, or before. They might live long after those times, and I am of opinion that they did.

To your Second *Query*, which is concerning the consistency of the two Opinions, this of the *μετεμψύχως*, and that of the *Resurrection*, How one can be consistent with the other? My Answer is this: Those *Jews* that hold the *μετεμψύχως*, do all, as well as the rest, acknowledge the *Resurrection*, but with this difference: They do not acknowledge the *Resurrection* of all *Humane Bodies* (for that cannot be) but they tell ye, that either the *first* or the *last* of those *Bodies*, to which the same *Soul* has been united, shall rise. *Abarbinel* is of Opinion that the *Resurrection* is to be of the *first*; but so is not *Menasseh Ben-Israel*; he alledges, that this does not agree with the Doctrine of the ancient *Zoar*. The *Cabbalists* there declare for the last. And their Words are these: *R. Hisquiba* says, *If you tell me that all*
G 4 *Bodies*

Bodies shall awake and rise again, pray tell me what will be become of those Bodies which were inform'd by one and the same Soul? R. Joseph answer'd: As for those Bodies which have deserv'd nothing, nor done any good, they shall be so dealt with as if they had never had a Being, and because they were as a dry Tree in this World, they shall also be as such in that which is to come. But the last Body that was inform'd by the Soul, shall rise again, because it was planted, and brought forth Fruit, and took Root as it ought.

I am now in the next place to shew, that, tho' the Doctrine of the Resurrection was not receiv'd by the Jews as a necessary Article of Faith 'till after our Saviour's time, yet it ought not to be lookt upon as the less certain on that account. And this I shall make out by shewing, that 'till after our Saviour's time there was nothing among them thought a necessary Article of Faith, or Term of Communion, but only the believing and owning the Law of *Moses*, and the worshipping in the Temple of *Jerusalem*; that the Immortality of the Soul it-self was not receiv'd by 'em as a necessary Article of Faith, or Term of Communion.

The truth of this will evidently appear, if we can prove, that the *Sadduces*, who denied not only the *Resurrection* of the *Body*, but also the *Immortality* of the *Soul*, were admitted by the *Jews* of those Times as Members of their Communion and true *Israelites*. Now that this was so, is apparent from these following Considerations.

First, In the *Acts of the Apostles* it is said, that, when *Peter* and *John* were preaching to the People in the Temple, * *The Priests and the Captain of the Temple*, and the *Sadduces* came upon 'em, being griev'd that they taught the People, and preach'd through *Jesus* the *Resurrection of the Dead*. And in the Chapter following, that there being a continual flocking of the People to the Apostles, the *High-Priest* rose up and all they that were with him (which is the *Seet* of the *Sadduces*) and were fill'd with *Indignation*. By which two places it appears, that the *Sadduces* in those Days were the Companions and Associates of the *Captain of the Temple* and the *Priests*; and not only so, but were also the most intimate Associates of the *High-Priest* himself. Which surely could never have been, had they been look'd upon as *Hereticks* and out of their Communion.

Se-

Secondly, It appears from the 23 Chap. of the same Book, that a part of their *Sanhedrin* it self, their great and Sacred Council, consisted of *Sadduces*, that one part was *Pharisees* and the other *Sadduces*. Nay, from thence we may gather that the Doctrine of a *future Life* might as well have been condemn'd by the *Sanhedrin* as the contrary Doctrine: Else how could St. Paul cry out to the *Pharisees*, that concerning the *Hope and Resurrection of the Dead* he was there call'd in *Question*. He means not strictly the Resurrection of the Body, but the Immortality of the Soul and the Life to come.

Thirdly, The *Sadduces* were not only the intimate Associates of the inferior *Priests* and the *High-Priests* themselves, and Members likewise of the *Sanhedrin*, but they were also advanc'd to the dignity of *High-Priests*, and own'd as such by all the *Jews* in general. *Josephus* is my Witness that † *Ananus* the younger, who was *High-Priest* in the time of the Emperor Nero, was by Sect a *Sadduce*, and that long before him, (above 100 Years before Christ) (a) *Hyrcausus*, the first of that Name, from a *Pharisee* became a *Sadduce*.

† *Antiq.*

XX. 8.

Ἀνάνης ὁ νεώτερος
ἑβραῖος καὶ
Σαδδουκαῖος.

(b) *Antiq.*

XIII. 18.

Fourthly,

Fourthly, *Josephus* tells us, that though the *Sadduces* were but few in Number, yet generally the (b) better sort of People, or Persons of considerable Quality, were of that Sect.

(b) *Ans.*
XVIII. 2.
Εἰς ὁλί-
γους τὴν ἀν-
δραίαν ἔτος
ὁ λόγος ἀ-
είκατο, ἵνα
πάντες
ἀρεῖται
τοῖς ἀξί-
οις.

A learned Jew, with whom I once discours'd concerning this Point, in answer to these Arguments, was pleas'd to tell me, that the Reason why in those times the *Sadduces* were admitted into the *Sanhedrin*, and into the *High-Priesthood*, was because of the over-ruling and arbitrary power of the Heathen Governours, and that Sect being in an especial manner encouraged by the supream Governours, it was on that account embrac'd by such as were of the greatest Quality. In Answer to which, I might observe, that, in the time of *Hyrcauus*, *Judea* was not in subjection to any Heathen Governour; neither does it appear that the *Sadduces* were peculiarly favour'd and promoted by the *Roman* Prefects. If they were, how came it to pass that in so long a time, and among so many *High-Priests*, there was only one *Sadduce* advanced to that Dignity. But I pass by these Considerations, and for a full reply to this Evasion, shall refer you to the following Arguments.

Fifthly,

Fifthly, Though the Sadduces were members even of the holy Sanhedrin, and one of the High-Priests had openly declar'd for that Sect, and another, that openly profess'd it, had been advanc'd to that Honour, yet we do not any where read that any of the learned Jews thought it unlawful or remonstrated against it. *Josephus* indeed tells us, that (a) the Sadduces had not any Power to speak of in the Government, but that when they were advanc'd to any place of Command, though unwillingly and by compulsion, they profess'd themselves Pharisees, because the Common-

(a) *Ant.* XVIII. 2.
Πρόσθετονται γὰρ αὐτῶν
ἑτέροις ὡς ἐπὶ τῶν ὀπίσθιων καὶ
ἐπ' ἀρχαῖς παρὰ τοὺς ἀ-
κούσιως μὲν καὶ ἀναγ-
χῇ, ἀκούσιως δ' ἐν οἷς
ὁ βασιλεὺς ἰσχύει διὰ τὸ
μὴ ἄλλως ἀνέχεσθαι γινώ-
σκοντες τοὺς πλείονας.

People would not otherwise endure 'em. This place may seem to make directly against me: but in reality it does not. On the contrary it makes directly for me: For *First*, It appears from hence, that they were not peculiarly favour'd and upheld by their Heathen Governours. *Secondly*, It appears that it was not the learned part of the Nation, but only the *Common People*, (τὰ πλῆθη) that would not endure to be under 'em. Though it was not a matter of Conscience, yet the People who had firmly embrac'd the Doctrine of the Resurrection and a fu-
ture

ture Life, so much hated the Opposers of it, as not to endure to be under their Government. That it was not through a Principle of Conscience (as if it had been *unlawful* and a *Sin* to be govern'd by 'em) that the People were so averse to 'em, but only because the People were acted and govern'd by their Passions, may from hence appear, that they could not endure to be under 'em in matters purely *Civil*, such as did not relate to any of their Religious Rights. *Josephus* speaks of Government in general. To this we may add, that it plainly appears that even the *Common People* themselves were sometimes contented to be under their Government, and to obey 'em as *High-Priests* and Members of their *Sanhedrin*. *Josephus* speaking of the High-Priest *Hyrannus* his turning *Sadducee*, observes, that on that account the (a) *Common-People* hated both him and his Sons. He does not say, that they thought it unlawful to be subject to such a High-Priest: But that they hated him. It should seem by what he says of their hating his Sons, as well as himself, on the account of his turning *Sadducee*, and abolishing the Institution of the *Pharisees*, that his Sons themselves as well as their Father, adher'd to that,

Sect :

(a) Ant.
XIII. 18.
Μισοῦσι γὰρ
ἐνταῦθα
αὐτῷ καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς
ἐξ ὧν τὸ
πλῆθος δι-
σέσται.

Sect : Yet at least two of 'em were after their Father successively *High-Priests*.

Sixthly, Josephus, though himself a *Pharisee*, is so far from thinking *Hyrcaus* a *Heretick* and uncapable of the *High-Priesthood*, because he was a *Sadducee*, that just after the account which he gives of his Conversion to that Sect, he has these Words concerning him. *Having appeas'd the Sedition*, (which was rais'd for the sake of the *Pharisees*) and living afterwards happily and governing excellently well, he died after he had been *High-Priest One and Thirty Years*, leaving behind him *Five Sons*, being judg'd by God worthy of the *Three greatest Honours*, the Government of the Nation, the Dignity of the *High-Priesthood*, and the gift of *Prophecy*. For he had *Communication with the Deity*, and had given him the Power of fore-knowing Things to come. Inasmuch that he fore-told that his Two eldest Sons should not long enjoy the *Principality* after him. The same Author speaking of the Three several Sects of the Jews, the *Pharisees*, *Sadducees* and *Essens*, calls 'em the three several Sects of the Jewish Philosophy.

(a) Ἰουδαίοις φιλοσοφία
τρῆς ἦσαν
ἐκ τῶ πέντε ἀρχαίων ἡ παλαιὰ, ἡ τε ἡ Εὐσυνῶν, καὶ ἡ ἡ Σαδδουκαίων, τρεῖς δὲ φιλοσόφον οἱ φαρισαιοὶ λεγόμενοι. Ant. XVIII. 2.

(a) There were three Sorts of Philosophy that obtain'd long since among the Jews,

that

that of the Essens, that of the Sadduces,
and a third of the Pharisees. Again in a-

nother place (a), There was
one Simon, a Galilean, that in-
stituted a particular Sect, not
at all agreeing with the rest.

For there were Three sorts of
Philosophy profess'd among the
Jews, one by the Pharisees, a-
nother by the Sadduces, and

a third by the Essens. 'Tis plain that
he look'd upon these Three Sects to
be no other among the Jews than those
several Sects of Philosophers were a-
mongst the Greeks; and that the Sad-
duces were no more accounted Hereticks
among the Former, than the Epeureans
or Staicks were among the Latter. I
must here add what I have already ob-
serv'd to you, that Josephus tells us, in his

Life, (b) that he had applied himself in
his Youth to these Three several Sects,
that having fully inform'd himself of
their several Placits and Institutions,
he might adhere to that which should
please him best. So indifferent a thing
was it to the learned Jews, whether
they were of this, or that, or the o-
ther. He might have profess'd either
of 'em, and been still a true Jew, but
the Tenets of the Pharisees best pleas'd
him.

(a) Ἦν δὲ ὅπως συ-
νήνης ἰδίᾳ αἰρέσις, ἡ-
δὲν τοῖς ἄλλοις προσεί-
χον, τρία γὰρ ἦσαν Ἰου-
δαίοις εἶδη φιλοσοφῶν,
καὶ τὴ μὲν αἰρετικὰ θα-
μισαῖον, τὴ δὲ Σαδδου-
καῖον, τρίτην δὲ Ἑσσηνοὶ
καλεῖν. Bel. l. 2. c. 12.

(b) Οὕτως
γὰρ ὥσπερ
αἰρήσεσθαι
καὶ αἰρεῖσθαι,
εἰς πῶς
καταμέ-
θοιμι.

I have already told you what time it was that the *Sadduces* first began to be condemn'd and rejected as *Hereticks* by the rest of the *Jews*, that it was about the end of the first Age after Christ, just after *Josephus's* Death: I shall now only remark, that the day on which they were ejected out of the *Sanhedrin*, which was the Seventh of the Month *Sebat*, or *January*, is remembred in the *Jewish Kalendar* as a *Holy-day*.

The *Fourth* and last thing I propos'd to do, relating to the Opinions of the *Jews*, was to shew, that the Doctrine of the *Resurrection*, and that too of the same *Humane* Body, was not only the common and receiv'd Doctrine of the *Jews* in the time of our Saviour, and as well before as ever since, but is likewise alluded to by the *Prophets* themselves.

Eusebius in his *Comment* on the *Fifth Verse* of the *First Psalm*, where there is mention made of the *Resur-*

* Συμείνωσι ὅτι πρὸς
τὸ Δαβὶδ καὶ ἀνάστασιν,
καὶ κρίσιν, καὶ ἐπαγγελίαν
τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος ἰδι-
οῦται, Μωϋσῆς οὐδὲν δι-
κνύει τὴν τὴν ἰδίαν.

rection and *Judgment*; * *Ob-*
serve (says he) *that David first*
clearly taught a Resurrection
and Judgment, and a promise
of a future Life, Moses having
deliver'd no such matter. Another of the
Ancients will not own that *David him-*
self

self speaks any where of the *Resurrection*. 'Tis the *Greek Scholiast* on the *Sixty-Fifth Psalm*, which has this Inscription *, *The Song of the Psalm of the Resurrection*. On this Inscription, or Title, he has these Words: † *The Resurrection of the Dead is not here meant (For David does not seem to have taught it any where) but they that made this Title, by the Word Resurrection seem to have meant the Return of the Jews out of the Babylonish Captivity.* The Author of the * *Clementine Recognitions* ^{L 1. c. 33.} makes *Abraham* the first that taught it. What my Opinion is, that it was revealed and known to the Prophets before the Flood, and by *Noah* transmitted down to his Posterity, I have already told you: I doubt not but that it was known by that means to *Abraham*, and from him convey'd down to the *Jews*, who were his Posterity. But as this Tradition was clearly worn out, and utterly lost in some Nations, and in almost all others much alter'd and corrupted, so even among the *Jews*, tho' it was always (so I think) the common and receiv'd Doctrine, yet the certainty of it, and the necessity of be-

H

lieving

* Ωδὴ ψαλμοῦ ἀναστάσεως,

† Ἀνάστασις ἐστὶν ὅσα καλεῖται ἡ ἐκ νεκρῶν (ὡς δὲ καὶ ὁ σὺν ταύτῃ φαίνεται) διδάσκει ὁ μακάριος Δαβὶδ) ἀλλὰ ἡ μεταστάσις εἶναι λέγειν οἱ ὀπρὸς πάντας τοὺς χριστιανούς τὴν ἀρχιμαλωσίαν τὴν ἐκ Βαβυλῶν.

lieving it, was doubted of by many.

That *Abraham* believ'd, that God was able to raise the Dead, and that his Son *Isaac* should have been rais'd up again, if he had been sacrificed, the Author to the † *Hebrews* assures us. *By faith Abraham when he was tried offer'd up Isaac: And he that had receiv'd the promises, offer'd up his only begotten Son, of whom it was said, That in Isaac shall thy Seed be called. Accounting that God was able to raise him up, even from the Dead.*

I shall not trouble you with those se-

(a) *Vide Menasseh Ben-Israel de Resur.* l. 1. c. 1, on. They are generally very Idle and Impertinent Observations. And so (to speak the truth) are many of those which are wont to be produc'd by some of our own (b) Writers. I shall lay before you only some few places out of the Old Testament, which seem to me to contain very manifest Allusions to, and Proofs of, this Doctrine.

(b) *Vide Epiphani.* u. Vol. 1. p. 25. & Vol. 2. p. 88, 99, 100, 101, Eulogium ap. Pëot. p. 886. I. See now, that I, even I, am he, and there is no God with me; I kill, and I make alive; I wound and I heal. Thus God, by the Mouth of *Moses* in his Song. *Dent.* 32. 39.

2. The

2. *The Lord killeth and maketh alive, he bringeth down to the Grave, and bringeth up. Hannah, the Mother of Samuel, in her Song, 1 Sam. 11. 6.*

3. *Thy dead shall live, together with my dead Body shall they arise: Awake and sing, ye that dwell in Dust: For thy Dew is as the Dew of Herbs, and the Earth shall cast out the Dead, Isaiah 26. 19.*

4. *The Fourth place is that of Ezech. † C. 37. where he speaks of the Valley full of dry Bones, that at the Word of the Lord, the Bones came together, Bone to his Bone, the Sinews and the Flesh came up upon 'em, and the Skin cover'd 'em above, and the Breath came into the Bodies, and they liv'd, and stood up upon their Feet. 'Tis agreed among the Rabbins, that in all these four places of Scripture, the Resurrection is foretold: And the first, and this last are cited for it by Josephus himself. The Rabbins have amongst 'em an Opinion, That the Bones, of which Ezechiel here speaks, were really rais'd up, and restor'd to life, and they mention the Names of some, who (they say) were descended from those that were then rais'd to Life.*

Menasseh Ben-Israel tells us, that the Sadduces were wont to interpret these places of Isaiah and Ezechiel, of the

temporal redemption of the People of *Israel*. And so this Prophecy of *Ezechiel* is expounded by *Origen*, against whose Opinion concerning an *Ethereal* Body, it would make directly, if understood of the *Resurrection*. The same *dry Bones* are said to come together *Bone to its Bone*, and to be cover'd with *Flesh*, &c. I am not unwilling~~ly~~ to grant, that both those Prophecies are *primarily* intended of a *temporal* redemption of the People of *Israel*: I freely own that they are. But at the same time, I dare appeal to any unprejudiced Person, whether they do ^{not} contain a clear and evident *Allusion* to the Doctrine of the *Resurrection*, and are *secondarily* intended of it.

* C. 12.
v. 2.

5. Another place is that of the Prophet *Daniel*: * *And many of them that sleep in the Dust of the Earth, shall awake, some to everlasting Life, and some to Shame and everlasting Contempt*: Which is generally understood of the *Resurrection*, not only by our own Writers, but likewise by all the *Rabbins*.

I must freely acknowledge, that the Word *many* makes this Text very difficult. I know what the Expositors say, but I am not satisfied with any thing that I have hitherto met with. Some tell us, that *many* is sometimes used in the

the Scripture to signify *all*, as in the *Fifty, Third of Isaiah*, where Christ is said to bear the Sins of *many*, and afterwards it is said that he bare the Sins of us *all*: So, say they, in the *Ninety Seventh Psalm, Verse 1. the many Isles* (as it is in the Original) signifies *all the Isles*. But this does not clear the Difficulty. For there is a great deal of difference between *many* and *many of*. All they that sleep in the Dust are *many*: but *many of* them that sleep in the Dust, cannot be said to be *all they* that sleep in the Dust. So, *the many Isles*, and, *many of the Isles*, are two quite different Expressions. *Many of*, does plainly except *some*. I was once inclin'd to believe, and the Fancy was grounded on this Text, That there may be some who shall not be rais'd up at all at the last day: And who were they (think you) who I fancied were not to rise? Such *Heathens* as live Morally well, and according to the Light that is given 'em. I was loath to rank 'em among the *miserable*, and I could not see how they could be *sav'd*. I was willing therefore to believe that there might be some middle way contriv'd by Providence, and that was *Annihilation*. I was willing to believe, that as all *wicked Men*,

of whatsoever Sect or Denomination, are to *rise* to *Damnation*, and all *good* Men that are within the Covenant of Grace, are to *rise* to *Salvation*; so those *good* Men, who are not within the *Covenant*, shall not *rise* at all, but be utterly *annihilated*. But this was a Fancy of but one Moment only. It was presently dash'd and confuted by our Saviour's express Assertion, that *all they that are in the Grave shall rise*, some to Salvation, and others to Damnation. On these Accounts I should willingly close with those Expositors who understand this Text, not *primarily* of the *Resurrection*, but of the deliverance of the *Jews* from those Burdens and Pressures they were under in the Reign of King *Antiochus*; and so by the Word *everlasting*, understand only *long*, as (you know) it is often used. But on this side too there occurs a very great difficulty. For if it were spoken of the Deliverance of the *Jews* from their Sufferings and Persecutions, how could it be said, that *some shall awake to shame and contempt*. I must own my Ignorance, how confident soever some others may be; and shall only make this Remark, That if it were meant of the temporal Restitution of the *Jews*, yet in the Expression

pression there seems to be a plain Allusion to the Doctrine of the Resurrection. 'Tis at least a *Metaphor* taken from that Doctrine, which was then entertain'd among the *Jews*. And *Grotius* himself acknowledges, that though not *Primarily*, yet *Secondarily* it is a Prophecy concerning it.

I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter Day upon the Earth. And though after my Skin, Worms destroy this Body, yet in my Flesh shall I see God : Whom I shall see for myself and my Eyes shall behold and not another, though my Reins be consum'd within me. Job XIX. 25, &c. This place I have already mention'd, to shew that the Resurrection was known to the ancient *Arabians*, supposing that it is rightly translated (which I am not very confident of) and that they were really the Words of *Job*. I now produce it, (on the same supposition) as the Testimony of an *inspired* Writer. It is generally understood by our Writers of the *Resurrection*, so it is by our Church in the Office of *Burial* ; so it was by (a) *St. Clement* Bishop of *Rome*, and by (b) *Origen* himself : But so it is not by

(a) Καὶ
λαβὼν λέγει,
καὶ ἀναστ-
σεις τὴν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὰ πάντα τὰ ἐναντία σου τὰ πάντα. Ep. I. ad
Cor. p. 36. ed. Jun. (b) Com. in Mat. p. 487.

any of the *Jewish* Doctors, though to prove the *Resurrection* they are wont to catch at very small things. They all understand it of the happiness of the next Life without any respect to the Resurrection of the Body. If we follow the *Vulgar Latin*, we cannot understand it any otherwise than of the Resurrection. For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that at the last Day I am to rise from the Earth. And I shall be again cover'd with my Skin ; and in my Flesh I shall see my God. Whom I my-self shall see, and my Eyes, and not another, shall behold him. This Hope is fixt in my Bosom. The Greek Translation is thus : For I know that he is everlasting, who shall deliver me on Earth, and raise up my Skin that suffered these things. For all these things have been done upon me by the Lord. Of all which I am conscious ; my Eye has seen 'em, and not another : and they have been all done unto me in my Bosom. For, raise up my Skin, the *Alexandrian Copy* has, And he shall raise up my Body. But *Origen's Copies* agreed with that which is published. *St. Clement of Rome* reads it thus : Thou shalt raise up my *Flesh*, which has suffered all these things. The *Chaldee Paraphrase* has it thus : And I know that my Redeemer lives, and hereafter
his

his Redemption will arise upon the Dust. And after my Skin shall be put up, this shall be. And in my Flesh I shall see God again. Whom I am to see for my-self, and my Eyes shall see him and not another. My Reins are consum'd within me. The Syriack thus: I know indeed that my Saviour lives, and that in the End he will appear upon Earth. And these things straiten'd (or encompass'd) my Skin and my Flesh. If my Eyes shall see God, they will see light. My Reins are quite peris'd within me. This has nothing at all relating to the Resurrection. And the learned Grotius, and others, are very positive, that this place cannot be understood of the Resurrection without wresting the Hebrew very much. The (a) Translation, which he gives us of it, is different from all others: And he expounds it of Job's sudden restitution to his former Health and temporal Prosperity. You may read this Exposition oppos'd in our learned Bi-

(a) Chri-
stiani non
pauci hoc
textu usi
sunt ad
proban-
dam Re-
surrectio-
nis fidem,

sed ut id facerent, coacti sunt in versionibus suis multum ab Hebræo discedere, ut notatum Mercero aliisque. Hebræa sic sonant: Scio ego Redemptorem meum vivere, & illum postremo statutum in Campo, (i. e. victorem futurum.) Eriam si non pellem tantum meam sed & hoc (nempe arvinam quæ sub pelle est) consumerent, (morbi sc.) in carne tamen meâ Deum videbo (i. propitium experiar:) Ego, inquam, hisce meis oculis; ego, non autem alius pro me. Defecerunt renes mei in sinu meo, (i. intima mea vorantur ex indignatione ob maledicta vestra.)

shop *Pearson's* Comment on the *Creed*. He calls it *a very new one*: But in that he's mistaken: For 'tis no more than what (a) *St. Chrysostom* long ago thought on, and did not dislike. Having laid these several Translations and Expositions before you, I shall leave this Text to your Judgment, without pretending to decide the Controversy. If you will not understand it of the *Resurrection*, yet what I undertook to make out, seems from other places sufficiently clear.

(a) *Cate-
ni in Job,
p. 340. l.*

I shall close this part of my Discourse, which is concerning the Traditions of the *Jews*, and the Testimonies of the *Old Testament*, with an observation concerning that Argument, which our Saviour makes use of out of the Books of *Moses*, to prove the Resurrection against the *Sadduces*. *As touching the Resurrection* (says he) *of the Dead, have you not heard that which was spoken unto you by God, saying; I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the Dead, but of the Living.* The most that this Argument proves, is the *Immortality* of the *Soul*, that the Souls of *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob* did not die with their Bodies, as the *Sadduces* believ'd: From whence I observe, that
it

it was not so much the *Resurrection* of the *Body*, as the *Immortality* of the *Soul*, that the *Sadduces* stuck at, and that if it could be once prov'd out of the Books of *Moses* that the *Soul* was *Immortal* and did not die with the *Body*, they were ready and willing to grant that there would be a *Resurrection* of the *Body*. Our Saviour thought it would be enough to convince 'em of the *Resurrection* of the *Body*, if they could but be convinc'd of the *Immortality* of the *Soul*.

If the Doctrine of the Resurrection were not so clearly reveal'd to the *Jews* as to be always own'd as a necessary Article of Faith, if they saw it through a *Glass* but darkly and obscurely ; yet it is not so with *Christians*. If they knew but in part, and prophesy'd but in part, yet he being come, which is perfect, that which was only in part, is to us done away. I shall now in the next place demonstrate the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the same *Humane* Body to be the Doctrine of the Gospel. And this I shall do by shewing,

First, That it is the Doctrine of the *New Testament*.

Secondly, That it is the Doctrine of the *Primitive Fathers*.

The Arguments which I shall draw from the *New Testament*, are these :

First,

*Doctrine
of the
Gospel*

First, Our Saviour's own Testimony concerning the place from whence the

(a) St.
John, v. 28.

Resurrection is to be. (a) *Marvel not at this: For the Hour is coming, in the which all that are in the Graves, shall hear his Voice, and shall come forth, they that have done Good, unto the Resurrection of Life, and they that have done Evil, unto the Resurrection of Damnation.* This is a plain and express Declaration that the Body that lies in the Grave is to rise again. To the same purpose St. John

(b) XX.
13.

in the Revelations (b), *And the Sea gave up the Dead which were in it, and Death and Hell (i. e. the Grave) deliver'd up the Dead which were in them: And they were judg'd every Man according to their Works.*

(c) Ap.
Epiphan.
Her. 64.
S. 16. E-
pist. 88, &c.
Sed dicit
aliquis:
Quomodo
resurgent
mortui, aut

'Tis confess'd by Origen himself, that the Bodies, to which our Souls are to be united in the Resurrection, will be rais'd up out of the Graves where the Dead are reposit'd: Yet he advances an *Hypothesis*, which supposes a diversity of Particles. He tells us, as (c) St. Methodius and

quali cum corpore venient? palam illud ostendit; primam subjectam materiam nullo modo resurgere. Nam si rectè propositum ab Apostolo exemplum accipimus, dicendum est, Seminis naturam, quæ frumenti grano insita est, vicinâ correptâ materiâ, totam illam pervadere atque illius pariter correptâ specie, vires suas in id, quod antè Terra, Aqua, Aer, Ignisque fuerat, transfundere, earumq; superatis qualitatibus, in illam ipsam cujus est artifex, convertere: Atque hoc modo perfici spicam, quæ à priore grano mirum in modum, & magnitudine & figurâ & varietate dissideat.

(d) St.

(d) St. Jerom represent^d his Opinon, that as a *Grain of Corn*, that is sown, has a Natural Principle or Faculty, by which it attracts the Particles of Matter that lie near it, and so grows up, and produces new Corn: So in the Substance of our Bodies, that lies dissolv'd in the Grave, there remain certain *semina resurrectionis*; a certain Power and Faculty, by which, in the Day of Judgment, at the sound of the Trump, the Dead shall in a moment *grow up*. There shall *spring up*, he says, from those Seeds *not the same Flesh*, but another, and with a *form* different from what we now have. The same *Hypothesis* he maintains in his *Work against Celsus* (c): *We say that as the Blade springs up from a grain of Wheat, so in the Body there is a cer-*

(d) Adv.
Jo. Hiero-
fol. p. 117.
Est, inquit,
singulis se-
minibus
ratio quæ-
dam à
Deo arti-
fice insita,
quæ fucur-
tas mate-
rias in me-
dullæ
principiis
tenet. Et
quomodo
tanta ar-
boris mag-
nitude,
truncus,
rami, po-
ma, folia,
non viden-
tur in se-
mine, sunt
tamen in
ratione se-

minis, quam Græci *σπυθηρισμὸν* vocant: Et in grano frumenti est intrinsecus, vel medulla, vel venula; quæ cum in terrâ fuerit dissoluta, trahit ad se vicinas materias, & in stipulam, folia, aristasque confurgit, aliudque moritur, aliud refurgit; neque enim in grano tritici, radices, culmus, folia, aristæ, paleæ sunt dissolutæ. Sic & ratione Humanorum Corporum manent quædam surgendi antiqua principia, & quasi *ἀρτισταί*, id est, seminarium mortuorum, sinu terræ confoveatur. Cum autem iudicii dies advenerit, & in voce archangeli, & in novissimâ tubâ tremuerit terra, movebuntur statim semina, & in puncto horæ mortuos germinabunt: Non tamen easdem carnes, nec in his formis restituent, quæ fuerunt.

(c) L. 5. p. 246. Ἡμεῖς μὲν ἢ ὅταν τὸ διασπαρὲν σῶμα ἐπαύρηται εἰς τὸ ἄρχον ἐύσιν, ὡς ἐστὶ τὸ διασπαρὲν τὸ κόκκον τὸ σῖτον ἐπαύρηται εἰς τὸ κόκκον τὸ σῖτον. Λέγουσαν γὰρ ὁσπερ ὅτι τὸ κόκκος τὸ σῖτον ἐγείρεται ἄρχον, ὅταν λέγῃς τίς ἔγειρε τὸ σῶμα, ἀφ' οὗ μὴ φημι μὲν ἐγείρεται τὸ σῶμα ἐν ἀφθοραῖς.

tain

tain natural Principle or Faculty, which as it is never corrupted it-self, so there Springs up from it an incorruptible Body.

† Nos vero post corruptionem mundi eodem ipsos futuros esse homines And the same we find again in a † Fragment produced by Pamphilus, out of his *Second Book concerning the Resurrection.* Yet there he says, that after the Resurrection we shall be the *very same Men.*

dicimus, licet non eodem statu, neque in iisdem passionibus. Non enim iterum ex conventionem viri & mulieris erunt, sed verbi gratia: ea ratio quæ continet Pauli substantiam, Pauli autem nunc dico corporalis quæ salva perinet: Et cum voluerit Deus secundum ea quæ dicta sunt, per Sacramentum tubarum in novissimâ tubâ facere ut Mortui resurgant, per illam ipsam substantiæ rationem quæ salva permanet, ut de terræ pulvere resuscitentur à mortuis ex omnibus locis, in quibus ratio illa substantiæ corporalis in ipsis corporibus permanebat, quæ in terram prolapsa Dei voluntate iterum resuscitantur. Et hoc arbitror asserere volentem dixisse Apostolum in 1 Ep. ad Cor. Post assertionem enim resurrectionis mortuorum, cum proposuisset sibi ea quæ possent ab aliis obijci; de resurrectione mortuorum sic ait: *Sed dicit aliquis, Quomodo resurgunt mortui? Quo autem corpore venient? Stulte, tu quod seminas non vivificatur, nisi prius moriatur; & quid seminas; non quod futurum est corpus seminas, sed nudum granum ut puta tritici, aut alicujus cæterorum, Deus autem dat illi corpus prout vult.* Cùm enim manifestissimè ostendisset quia mortui resurgunt, & certum esset quia Salvator noster cum ipso corpore resurrexisset, quod susceperat ex Mariâ, non autem satis clarum esset quomodo resurrexerint cæteri, vel quale corpus habituri: Comparat resurrectionem seminibus quæ seminantur in terrâ, ut puta grano frumenti, quod quum ceciderit in terram corrumpitur: Sed rationis illius virtus est insita in interioribus ejus medullis: Ipsa rationis virtus assumpta adjacens sibi terram, vel aquæ humorem, seu aeris circumstantem temperiem, caloris quoque sufficientem recipiens fomitem per divinam potentiam co-operantem culmi vel spicæ confurgunt: Et hoc est quod dicit: *Tu quod seminas, non vivificatur nisi prius moriatur: Et quid seminas, non corpus quod futurum est seminas.* Ergo hoc quod cadit in terram corpus nostrum, comparatum est grano frumenti.

The Foundation of this *Hypothesis* of *Origen*, is St. Paul's comparing our *Resurrection* to the *growing of Corn*; of which I shall speak by and by, and shew how unreasonable it is to argue against the *Identity* of the *Body* from that Comparison. To shew the Absurdity of this *Hypothesis*, let us suppose that the Body was never buried, but expos'd in the Air, or perfectly burnt to Ashes, or drown'd and dissolv'd in the Sea, and let this be done some *Thousands* of years ago: I would ask an *Origenist*, Where are then his *principia resurrectionis*? 'Tis impossible to conceive any such *semina resurgendi*, unless we will suppose that there always remains some little part of the Body undissolv'd. And therefore some of the *Jews*, who will have the Body to be made up in the Resurrection by *growing* as out of a *Seed* (and from whom *Origen* seems to have borrow'd his Notion) tell us, that there is a certain little Bone in the Body of a Man (they call it * *Luz*) which can never be dissolv'd. But in such cases as we suppose, it is highly probable, that there may not be remaining, after so many Motions and Transmutations, any two Particles or Atoms united together, which were united in the Body when alive.

* *Vide Pocock in Postam Musis, p. 113, 119.*



alive. At least it cannot be imagin'd, that there can remain so many Particles united together as are necessary to the making up of such a *Semen*. To this you may add, that the Earth is the proper and natural Matrix of the Seeds of Corn, and the like, in which it is design'd by Nature that they should germinate, and produce their kind: But the Body of a Man is naturally begotten and form'd after a quite different manner. It is therefore very absurd to imagine, that because the Grains of Corn contain such *semina* within 'em as may germinate and *bring forth* in the Earth, therefore likewise in the Particles of a Man's Body there may be such natural *Semina* from whence a new Body may *rise*. I need not observe, that if our Bodies had any such natural *Semina*, it must thence follow, that the Body which *rises* or *springs up*, would be, not of a different kind from that which was buried, as *Origen* would have the *rising* Body to be, but altogether of the same, since the Seeds of all things do naturally produce their own Kind. From a *Humane* Body there would spring up a *Humane* Body, not a *Subtle* and *Ethereal* one.

The

The *Socinians* (who deny the Resurrection of the *same* Body) to avoid the force of this Argument which has been urg'd for it, are forc'd to deny that our Saviour there speaks of the *real* Resurrection. They affirm, that he only spake of a *spiritual* Resurrection, and that only the Graves of Ignorance and Impiety are there intended. But this Evasi-
 on is very well confuted by a * very
 great Man, who observes, that this Ex-
 position cannot possibly agree with what
 Christ says. "He speaks expressly of
 "bringing Men to Judgment, and divides
 "those which are to come out of their
 "Graves into two Ranks, neither of
 "which can be so understood. The
 "first are those *which have done good*,
 "before they come out of the Graves;
 "these therefore could not be the Graves
 "of Ignorance and Impiety, from which
 "no good can come. The Second are
 "those which *have done evil*, and so re-
 "main as evil Doers, and therefore can-
 "not be said to have come *forth* out
 "of the Graves of Ignorance and Im-
 "piety, or to rise by the preaching of
 "the Gospel, to newness of Life, be-
 "cause they are expressly said to come
 "forth *unto the Resurrection of Dam-*
 "*nation*. And that those Words ought

* *Bishop*
Pearson on
the Creed,
p. 382.

to be understood not of a *spiritual* Resurrection, but of that which shall be at the last Day, is confess'd and proved by * some of the *Socinians* themselves.

* *Vide*

Slichtingii

Com. in
locum.

I need not add, that the Words of St. *John*, which I have cited out of the *Revelations*, are beyond all dispute concerning the *real* Resurrection in the Day of Judgment. Neither shall I observe, that if both these places were to be understood in a *Metaphorical* sense, yet even the Allusion or *Metaphor* would afford a sufficient Argument: For our Saviour, or St. *John*, would not have alluded to this Doctrine after such a manner, if it had not been true.

II. My Second Argument shall be taken from those Words of our Saviour in St. *Mat.* † *And fear not them which kill the Body, but are not able to kill the Soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both Body and Soul in Hell.* Here he plainly declares that the *Body* which will be in Hell is the same with that which might have been *kill'd*.

† 10. 28.

III. My Third Argument is those Words of our Saviour in the same Evangelist *, *And if thy right Eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee: For it is profitable for thee that one of thy Members should perish, and not that thy whole*

* v. 29, 30.

whole Body should be cast into Hell. And if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off, and cast it from thee: For it is profitable, &c. He tells us here, not only that the *Body*, which will be cast into Hell, is numerically the same, but also that it will have all the same *Limbs* and *Parts*.

To these express Testimonies of our Lord, we may add these two following Observations concerning Him:

IV. *First*, that when he had told *Martha* that her Brother *Lazarus* should be rais'd up out of his Grave to Life, and she replied, That she knew that he would rise again in the Resurrection at the last Day, speaking plainly of the very same Body that then lay dead; He seems by his silence, to assent to what she said.

V. *Secondly*, That when the *Sadduces* propos'd him the Question concerning the *Seven Brethren* who had married the same Woman, *Whose Wife she should be in the Resurrection?* He does not take notice of any Error the *Jews* were guilty of in supposing the Body would be a *Humane Body*; but only corrects 'em as to their Fancy concerning *Marriages* in the next Life: *For in the Resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the Angels of God in*

Heaven. — As the Angels of God in Hea-

† *Com. in*
Mat. p.
48.

ven? Yes: But he does not mean, as
† *Origen* understands it, in respect to the
nature and substance of their Bodies, but

* *St. Hie-*
ron. l. i.
adv. Joen.
In Resur-
rectione
mortuo-
rum, non
nubent,
neque nu-
bentur, sed
similes e-
runt An-
gelis.
Quod alii
postea in
Cœlis fu-

in reference to * *marriage*, which was
the Subject of the Question. Had he
intended the *nature and substance* of their
Bodies, or if he had dislik'd the com-
mon and receiv'd Opinion concerning
the *Humanness* (if I may use that Word)
of the rising Body, he would not have
used those Words, but such as these:

For in the Resurrection they neither mar-
ry, nor have humane Bodies, as your Que-
stion supposes, but are, &c.

turi sunt, hoc virgines in terrâ esse cœperunt. Si Angelorum no-
bis similitudo promittitur: inter Angelos autem non est sexûs di-
versitas; aut sine sexu erimus, quod Angeli sunt; aut certè quod
liquido comprobatur, resurgentes in proprio sexu, sexûs non funge-
mur officio. *Idem adv. Joan. Hierosol.* Angelorum nobis similitudo
promittitur; id est, Beatitudo illa, in quâ sine carne & sexu sunt
Angeli, nobis in carne & sexu nostro donabitur. Mea rusticitas sic
credit, & sic intelligit, sexum confiteri sine sexuum operibus; homi-
nes resurgere, & sic eos Angelis adæquari. — Similitudo autem
ad Angelos, non hominum in Angelos demutatio, sed profectus im-
mortalitatis & Gloriæ est. Vide *St. Methodium ap. Epiphan. Har.*
64. §. 33.

VI. My *Sixth* Argument shall be the

|| *1 Cor.*
15. 53.

express Testimony of *St. Paul*, || *This*
corruptible must put on incorruption, and
this mortal must put on Immortality. That
Body which in this Life is Mortal and

Cor-

Corruptible, * *the same* in the next Life * *St. Hieron. adv. Joan & irrosol. Quod verò dicit Apostolus Corruptibile hoc & mortale.*

hoc ipsum corpus, id est, carnem, quæ tunc videbatur, ostendit. Quod autem copulat, induere incorruptionem & immortalitatem: Illud indumentum, id est, vestimentum, non dicit corpus abolere quod ornatur in gloriâ; sed quod antè inglorium fuit, efficere gloriosum: Ut mortalitatis & infirmitatis viliore veste deposita, immortalitatis auro, & ut ita dicam, firmitatis atque virtutis beatitudine, induamur, volentes non spoliari carne, sed supervestiri in gloriâ, & domicilium nostrum, quod de cælo est, superindui desiderantes, ut devoretur mortale a vitâ. Certè nemo superinduitur, nisi qui antè vestitus est. Epiphanius *Her. 66. c. 68. Καὶ ἡ ἐκείνη, &c.* Non dixit *Mortale* solum, neque *corruptibile* solum, nec *immortalem* denique animam. Sed *corruptibile hoc & mortale*, addito utrobique pronomine *hoc*.

VII. The *Seventh* shall be taken from the Testimony of the same Apostle concerning those that shall be *living* at the Day of Judgment. He tells us that they who are then living shall not die, but only be *chang'd* or *alter'd*. It is therefore certain that the Bodies of those that shall be then living, will continue the very *same* as to substance, tho' *changed* or *alter'd* as to *Qualities*. It cannot be imagin'd that the *change* will be of all the Substance; that the whole Body will be in a Moment destroy'd, and the Soul be invest'd with new Matter. For the Soul to be separated from all

the Substance of its Body together, what is that else but to *die* ? But the Apostle expressly assures us, that we *shall not all die*, but some will only be *chang'd*. What can be more plain than those Words of the same Apostle (a) ? *The Dead in Christ shall rise first, then we (i. e. they) which are alive and remain, shall*

* Epiphanius *Her.* 64. §. 70. *Ὁ ὁμοῦς Ἀποστόλος αἰν, Nos rapiemur nubibus in occursum illius : Ut hoc ipsum corpus verè esse, non præter ipsum aliud, ostenderet. Nam qui rapitur, nondum est mortuus, &c.*

* *be caught up together with them in the Clouds, to meet the Lord in the Air : And so shall we ever be with the Lord.* Now since the Bodies of that Generation which shall be living at the last Day, are to consist of the same individual

Particles, how is it credible that the Bodies of those that are rais'd shall be made up of New ? Is it Credible that there will be in Heaven such a Disparity ? that some shall retain their old Bodies,

(a) 1. Cor. XV. 52. *others have new Ones ? (a) The Dead (says the Apostle) shall be rais'd Incorruptible, and they that are living shall be chang'd : The Reason he gives is the same for both ; For this Corruptible must put on Incorruption, &c. And from thence it is evident, that as are the Bodies of those that are only changed, such will be the Bodies of those that rise.*

But

But how does this agree with that Comparison, which the same Apostle makes, between the Resurrection of our Bodies, and the growing of *Corn*? The Apostle observes that the *Corn which is sown, is not the same with that which shall be*, and he plainly applies this to our *Resurrection*. Does not that prove, that the Body, which rises, will be no more the same with that which died, than *Corn* is the same with that from whence it sprung? This is that Place (as I have already said) on which *Origen*, and the rest of our Adversaries, chiefly ground their Opinions. My Answer is this: There is no necessity we should take the Comparison in all respects strictly. You know, we have a *Maxim* in the *Schools*, that *no Similitude walks on Four Feet*: The meaning is, that *Similitudes*, and *Comparisons*, are always *Lame*, and ought to be understood loosely, and only in *some respect*. And so ought this Comparison, which the Apostle uses. All that he means by it, is this, That as a Grain of *Corn*, which springs up, differs from that which was sown; so the Body which rises, shall not be altogether the same, but shall differ in some Respects from that which was buried. I observe that the Question which the Apostle answers,

is, ποῖον σῶματι ἔρχεται; with what sort of Body the Dead shall rise? I observe the Word Ποῖον σῶματι; with what sort of Body as to its Qualities? And as the Question is only concerning the ποιότης, or Quality, of the Body, so ought the Answer to be understood to intend no other.

There is nothing more certain than that of all Arguments, the weakest are those that are taken from Comparisons; so loosely are Comparisons wont to be used. I shall crave your Leave to give you here a few Instances, relating to the Subject now before us. The Resurrection of our Bodies is compared to the growing of Corn, not only by the Apostle, but by almost all the Fathers, yet they at the same time own expressly the Identity of the Body. The Greek Church uses boil'd Wheat as a Symbol of it. In their great Festivals, after the Sacrament, they have usually an Entertainment for the Congregation which they call κολύβων προσφορά the offering of the Colyba, which is boil'd Wheat, mixt (for the better relish) with some other things. The Priest goes about with a Charger full of it, and distributes it to all that are present, as a Symbol of the Resurrection, and in (a) Memory of the Dead. The Arch-Bishop of

(a) Oratio
τῶν κολύ-
βων. ap.
Eucholog.
p. 658.

of *Philadelphia*, *Gabriel Severus*, has left us a particular Treatise concerning this *Rite* of the *Greek Church*. We are told indeed by some Writers that in the beginning this Custom had no respect to the Resurrection: But whatever was the meaning of those that first instituted it, 'tis certain, that they who now continue it, referr it to the Resurrection. The *Muscovites* are wont to use *Eggs* as *Symbols* of the Resurrection. (b) Every Year against *Easter*

they die or colour Red a great Number of *Eggs*, of which every Man and Woman gives to the Priest of the Parish upon *Easter Day* in the Morning. The Common-People use to carry in their Hands one of these red Eggs, the Persons of Quality *Gilded Ones*, on *Easter Day*, and Three or Four Days after. And, meeting their Friends, one takes the other by the Hand, and one of 'em saying, *The Lord, or Christ, is risen*, the other answers, *It is so of a Truth*: Then they kiss one another, and exchange their *Eggs*. The *Jews* make *Grass* to be a *Symbol* of it. Some of the ancient *Fathers* are pleas'd to tell us, that (a) *Trees* and *Plants* putting forth Leaves and Flowers in the Spring-Time, and bearing Fruits, are *Types* and

(b) Description of Russia ap. Hackluyt 10. 1. p. 318.

(a) St. Macarius Hom. 5. St. Cyrilus Hierosol. Catech. 18.

Em-

(c) St.
Clemens
Rom. Ep.
ad Cor.
p. 34. St.
Theophilus
Antioch. ad
Autol. l. 1.
p. 77. Ter-
tullian. A-
polog. c. ult.
De Re-
sur. c. 12.
St. Ambros.
De Resur.
Orentius in
Commonito-
rio. Chry-
sologus
Serm. 57,
59, 118.

Emblems of it. Some compare it to the *healing* of *Wounds* : Others, and (c) those too some of the chief of the ancient Doctors of the Church, to the revolution of *Night* and *Day*, *Darkness* and *Light*, to one Month's following another, and one *Year's* arising from another. Nay, they tell us that these *Alternations* are manifest Proofs and Demonstrations of the resurrection. Now from such *Symbols* and *Comparisons* as these, who would not be apt to conclude, that they do not believe the Resurrection of the *Same Body* ? Yet certain it is, that they all profess and assert this Doctrine.

That St. Paul meant the very same Body as to Substance will further appear from what I shall observe hereafter concerning the Incredulity of the *Corinthians* in the time of St. Clement Bishop of Rome.

VIII. My *Eighth* Argument shall be taken from the Example of our *Saviour's* Resurrection. The Apostle tells us, That Christ was *The first Fruits of those that slept* ; that by him came the *Resurrection of the Dead* ; that, as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive : Every Man in his own Order ; Christ the *First-Fruits* , afterwards they that are
Christ's

Christ's at his coming. Again, to the *Romans*, he says, that *He that rais'd Christ from the Dead, shall also quicken our mortal Bodies* : And in his *Epistle to the Philippians*, he assures us in the most express Terms, That *Jesus Christ, whom we look for from Heaven, shall change our vile Body, that it may be fashioned like to his Glorious Body.* From all which I infer, that † as was our Saviour's Body after his Resurrection, such will ours be in our Resurrection. Now that the *same* Body of Christ which was crucifi'd and buried, was rais'd again, and that it continu'd a true *Humane* Body, there is no one, I think, can doubt who truly believes the Scripture, or our Saviour's own Words. For what if by His Divine Power He was pleas'd to convey Himself into a Room, when the Doors were, or seem'd to be, shut? What if

† Passio-
nem quo-
que ejus
in cruce
& mortem
ac sepulcu-
ram, quæ
universa,
servavit,
ac resur-
rectionem
veritate &
non puta-
tive confi-
temur :
Qui & pri-
mo geni-
tus ex

mortuis, primitias massæ corporum nostrorum, quas in sepulchro positas suscitavit, pervexit ad cælum, spem nobis resurrectionis in resurrectione proprii corporis tribuens, unde & omnes sic speramus resurgere ex mortuis, sicut ille resurrexit. Non in alijs quibusdam peregrinis & in alienis corporibus quæ assumuntur in phantasmate : Sed sicut ipse in illo corpore, quod apud nos in sancto sepulchro conditum resurrexit : Ita & nos in ipsis corporibus, quibus nunc circundamur, & in quibus nunc sepelimur, eadem ratione & visione speramus resurgere. *Joannes Episc. Hierosol. ap. S. Hieron. in l. adu eum.* Eodem argumento, viz. Exemplo resurrectionis Christi *primogeniti mortuorum ac primitiarum dormientium* utitur *St. Methodius ap. Epiphani. Her. 64. §. 39.* & ipse *Epiphanius in Ancor. c. 94.*

he

* *St. Hieron. l. 1. adv. Jovin.*
 Certe in resurrectione eadem erit corporum substantia, quā nunc utimur, licet auctior gloriā. Nam & Salvator in tantum ipsum corpus habuit post inferos, in quo & crucifixus est, ut manus perforatas clavis & lateris vulnus ostenderet. Porro si clausis ingressus est ostiis, quod humanorum corporum natura non patitur, ergo & Petrum & Dominum negabimus vera habuisse corpora, quia ambulaverunt super aquas, quod contra naturam est. *Idem adv. Joan. Hierosol.* Dic mihi, acutissime disputator, quid est majus, tantam Terræ magnitudinem appendere super nihilum, & super aquarum incerta librare: An Deum transire per clausam portam, & creaturam cedere creatori? Quod majus est tribuis: quod minus est calumniari. Petrus super aquas ambulat gravi & solido corpore. Mollis unda non cedit: paululum fides dubitat, & statim naturam suam corpus intelligit: ut sciamus super aquas non corpus ambulasse, sed fidem.

he vanish'd away out of the Sight of those that convers'd with him? This was done * to demonstrate his Power. I shall not alledge with a late learned and ingenious (a) Author, that by *θυρών καλεισμένων* is not meant that the Doors of the Room, into which our Saviour entered, were then actually *shut*, but only that it was then *Night*. Though indeed it was in the Night that He appear'd, yet because it cannot be prov'd (as I think it cannot) that that Phrase is any where else us'd to signify the *Night-time*, and 'tis likely that the Doors of their Houses were wont to be *shut* (tho' perhaps not *bolted*) as well in the *Day-time* as at *Night*, and therefore it could not be well us'd to signify the *Night-time*: I am content to understand the Words in the common acceptation. Yet (I say) it cannot be thence prov'd that our Saviour's Body was not then a true *humane* Body. But if the Doors were then really

(a) Dr. Wallis of the Sabbath. I. Part, p. 25.

shut,

shut, and his Body were truly of the Nature of *Man's*, how was it possible for him to enter into the Room? In answer to this I ask another Question, How was it possible for our Saviour to walk on the *Water* as he did, and to make *St. Peter* do the like? Was not that contrary to the Nature of a *Humane* Body? I shall not pretend to prescribe a way to the *Almighty*. But this I am sure of, it was easie for *Omnipotence* to effect that Miracle several ways. He might either open a passage into the Room which the Disciples did not see, or rarefy his Body for that present Moment. So likewise he might *vanish away*, either by an exceeding swift Motion, or by altering the Medium, or the Sight of the Spectators. And thus *St. Luke* tells us, that when he appear'd to some of his Disciples in the way, and convers'd with 'em, they did not know him. What was the Reason of that? *St. Mark* says that he *appear'd in another form*: But was it really so? No, the difference was in † *their* Sight, not in his

† *St. Hieron. adv. Joan. Hierosol. Noli potentiam Domini magorum præstigiis adæquare, ut videatur fuisse quod non fuit, &*

putetur comedisse sine dentibus, ambulasse sine pedibus, fregisse panem sine manibus, loquutus esse sine lingua, & latus monstrasse sine costis. Et quomodo, inquires, non cognoscebant eum in itinere, si ipsum habebat corpus quod ante habuit? Audi scripturam dicentem: Oculi eorum tenebantur, ne eum cognoscerent. Et rursus, Aperti sunt oculi eorum, & cognoverunt eum. Nunquid alius fuit quando non agnoscebatur, & alius quando agnitus est? Certe unus atque idem erat. Cognoscere ergo & non cognoscere, oculorum fuit, non ejus qui videbatur, licet & ipsius fuerit, &c.— Coun-

Countenance. St *Luke* expressly affirms, that *their eyes were held that they should not know him*: And as soon (says he) as their *Eyes were open'd*, they knew him. Whatsoever means his Almighty Power was pleas'd to make use of, we have his own express Testimony for it, that his Body was the very same with that which was crucified, and that it was still truly *Humane*, consisting of *Flesh and Bones*. He ate with his Disciples as a *Man*, and had the *Holes*, which the Nails had made, in his Hands and his Feet, and his *Wound* still remaining in his Side. Which he therefore was pleas'd to preserve, that St. *Thomas*, and all Unbelievers, might be fully convinc'd of the *reality* of his Resurrection. When he enter'd into the Room amongst his Disciples, and they thought he had been a *Spirit*, because they did not see the Door open'd. * *Why*, says he, *are you troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I my-self: Handle me, and see, for a Spirit hath not Flesh and Bones as ye see me have.* And according to this we declare in the Fourth Article of our Church, that Christ being dead and buried, took again his Body, with *Flesh, Bones, and all things appertaining to Man's Nature.* Cle-
mens

* St. *Luke*
XXIV. 39.

mens Alex. in a Fragment of his *Comments* on the 1 *Ep. of St. John*, which is extant in *Cassiodorus*, tells us of an odd sort of || *Tradition*, that *St. John* once touching *Christ's Body*, thrust his *Hand* into the inward parts of his *Body*, the hardness of the *Flesh* not at all resisting it, but giving way to it. But this *Tradition* was not concerning his *Body* after his *Resurrection*, but even before he was crucified; and to this

|| *Fertur in Traditionibus*, quoniam *Joannes* ipsum corpus quod erat extrinsecus tangens, manum suam in profunda misisse, & ei duriciem carnis nullo modo reluctatam esse, sed locum manui prebuisse discipuli. Propter quod & insert: *Et manus nostra contestaverunt de verbo vite*; *contrectabilis* utique factus est qui venit in carne.

they imagin'd that *St. John* had respect in these Words: *That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have look'd upon, and our hands have handled of the Word of Life.* To prove the *Humanness* of *Christ's Body* after his *Resurrection*, I might add, if need were, the *Testimony* of * *St. Ignatius*. *I know* * *Ep.*
(says he) *and believe that even after his* *ad Smyrna.*

Hist. III. 36. Ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐσθραὶ αὐτὸν ὀρίσθαι καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ ὅτι πρὸς τοῦ θεοῦ Πάτρὸς ἡλίουθεν, ἔσθρα αὐτοῖς λαβὼν τὸ ἁγίασμα καὶ ἰδόντες, ὅτι ἐκ οἰμὸς μόνον σώματος, καὶ εὐδοκῶντος ἡλίουθεν, καὶ ὀρίσθαι. *St. Jerom* in *Catalogo Script. Eccles.* understands his Words so as if he had meant that he himself saw *Christ* after his *Resurrection*. *Super personā Christi ponit Testimonium*, dicens: *Ego verò & post resurrectionem in carne eum vidi, & credo quia* sit, &c.

Resur-

Resurrection he appear'd in the Flesh. And when he came to Peter and the rest, he said unto them, Take hold of me, handle me, and see that I am not an incorporeal Spirit. And immediately they touch'd him, and believ'd. Instead of those Words in our Creed, *And ascended into Heaven*, the Primitive Church asserted expressly in their Creed, that *he ascended into Heaven in the Flesh.* The Church

† *Adv. Hæ. L. 2. Ecclesia per universum orbem usque ad fines terræ seminata, & ab Apostolis & à Discipulis eorum accepit eam fidem quæ est in unum Deum — Et in unum Iesum Christum Dei F. incarnatum pro nostrâ salute. — Et in CARNE in cœlos assumptionem dilecti Iesu Christi Domini nostri, &c.*

* *Lib. de Sacris Antiochie Legibus ap. Phot. Bibl. P. 794.*

(says St. † *Irenæus*) spread throughout the whole World, to the ends of the Earth, hath receiv'd this Faith from the Apostles and their Disciples, that there is one God, — That Jesus Christ the Son of God was incarnate for our Salvation — and that he was taken up in the *Flesh* into Heaven. &c. *Ephremius* *, Patriarch of Antioch, affirms that

Christ is now known in the *Flesh*. St. *Athanasius* affirms that he carried up into Heaven the very same † *Flesh* that he had when living. And (to mention no more) in the Synodical Epistle of the Church of Rome, under Pope *Damasus*, there's an *Anathema* denounced

* *Orat. 4. c. Ari-
anos. Ὁρί-
να ἐπὶ τῶν
τοῖς ἀγ-
γέλαις ἀνα-
βάσαντες
ἀνθρώποις,*

ὃς ἀναβάντες οὐκ ἔγινον ἢ ἐπὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν.

against

against any one that shall not confess, That
 (a) He sits on the right Hand of the Fa-
 ther in the Flesh, which he had when li-
 ving, and that he shall come in the same to
 judge the quick and the dead. The same
Anathema you may read in (b) *Vigilius*
Tapsensis.

(a) Ap.
 Theodoret
 Hist. v. 2.
 Εἰ πρὸς μὴ
 εἴπῃ, ὅτι
 ἐν σαρκὶ
 ἦν πρὸς αὐτὸν.
 λῃς, κα-
 θίζῃ) ἐν

τῇ δεξιᾷ τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐν ᾗ καὶ ἐλάυσθη) κεῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, ἀνά-
 θημα ἴσθι.

(b) L. 6. De Trinitate inter opera St. Athanasii, p. 571. Si quis
 confitetur Filium Dei quasi phantasma, sic in homine visum fuisse,
 anathema illi. Si quis confitetur, verum hominem, quem assumpsit, non
 verè manducasse, aut bibisse, aut lacrymatum fuisse, sanguinem su-
 dasse, & passum fuisse, & resurrexisse, & in cælis ad dextram Patris
 consedisse, anathema illi.

IX. That our Resurrection will be of
 the same nature with our Saviour's, and
 our Bodies the same as his was, that is,
 numerically the same with those that di-
 ed, consisting of the same Particles, and
 still truly *Humane*, I shall farther prove
 from the Example of those who rose
 out of their Graves at the time of his
 Resurrection. And the Graves were o-
 pened (says St. Matthew) and many Bo-
 dies of Saints which slept, arose, and came
 out of the Graves after his Resurrection,
 and went into the Holy City, and appear'd
 unto many. This was to shew, that
 Christ by his Resurrection had conquer'd
 Death, and the Dead were then rais'd
 as an Earnest of our future Resurrecti-

on. We may here observe, *First*, That the Bodies of those that appear'd were not form'd of other *Matter*, but the same that lay buried in the *Graves*, arose. *Secondly*, That the *Graves* were open'd that the Bodies might arise, and come forth; which demonstrates that those Bodies were not *Subtle* and *Ethereal*, but of a *Gross* Humane Substance. And this is likewise evident from those Words, *and appear'd unto many*. For what else can be understood by those Words, but that they so appear'd as to be *known*.

X. To these Examples we will here add those *Types* of our Resurrection which are mention'd in the Old Testament; I mean the Translations of *Enoch* and *Elias*. The *Author to the Hebrews*, tells us that *Enoch* was translated that he should not see Death: And the same is true of *Elias*. 'Tis the Opinion, I know, of some of the *Rabbis*, that the Bodies, in which *Enoch* and *Elias* were translated, were immediately dissolv'd, and that new ones were created for 'em after the same likeness. But this is a Conjecture altogether groundless and precarious. And it is not, I think, to be doubted, but that as they were translated in their Bodies, so they still retain the very same, and will always retain

retain 'em. And this to me is another very clear * Demonstration, that the Bodies to which our Souls are to be united in the next Life, will be numerically the same.

* The same Argument is produced by St. Jerom, adv. Joan. Hierosol.

Enoch translatus est in carnē. Elias carneus raptus est in cœlum: necdum mortui & paradisi jam coloni, habent membra cum quibus rapti sunt, acque translati. Quoi nos imitatur junio, illi possident Dei consortio, vescuntur cœlesti pane, & saturantur omni verbo Dei: eundem habentes dominum quem & cibum. Paulo post: Enoch & Elias tanto tempore in eadem permanent aetate, quā rapti sunt. Habent dentes, ventrem, genitalia; & tamen nec cibis nec uxoribus indigent. And by Epiphanius in Ancorato, c. 100. & Pomerio Her. 64. c. 64.

XI. I shall conclude all these Arguments with another drawn from the proper signification of the Word *Resurrection*, which is every where used in the New Testament, and signifies *rising again*. If the same Particles of Matter that were buried be not to *rise*, if the Body is to be altogether new as to its Substance, how can it be said to be a † *Resurrection*, a *rising a-*

† St. Methodius, ap.

Epiphanius Her. 64. §. 35. Καίτοι τὸ ἀζένωσθαι, &c. Vocabulum ipsum (Resurrectio) hæc resurrectura esse corpora ostendit. Nam resurrectio non de eo, quod nunquam tenuit, sed de eo quod cecidit, atque iterum assurgit, usurpatur. Non enim quod non moritur, sed quod moritur, inclinare dicitur. At moritur caro. Anima quippe immortalis est. Quapropter si immortalis est anima, corpus vero cadaver est: Qui ita resurrectionem fore confitentur, ut eam nihil ad carnem pertinere putent, resurrectionem funditus negant. Quandoquidem non illud quod stat, sed quod cecidit, & inclinatur, exurgere dicitur: pro eo sc. scriptum est. Num qui cecidit, non resurgit? Jer. 2. 4. Eodem modo argumentatur Photius Epist. 1. ad Gaian.

gain? That Body which *rises again* must be that which once *died*: For nothing can be said to *rise again*, but that which once *fell*. If a *new* Body be to be created, and united to the Soul, if all that we are to expect be only this, that after Death our Souls will be again united to a Body, certainly they would never have chosen so very *improper* a Word to express it, as *Avatars*, or *Resurrection*.

It's generally suppos'd by Natural Philosophers, that in the space of about Seven Years, all the Particles of a Man's Body are chang'd: Now suppose (you will say) that a Man should keep his Bed for above Seven Years together, and at last should recover and *rise again*, tho' there be not one Particle in his Body, when he *rises*, the same that he had when first he began to keep his Bed, yet the Body with which he rises may properly be said to be the very same. The Body in such a case may properly be said to *rise again*. I answer, that there's a great deal of difference betwixt a Body whose Particles are *gradually* chang'd in a continu'd union with the Soul, and a Body whose Particles are chang'd, not *gradually*, but all together. Altho' in the case suppos'd,

the

the Body is understood to be the same, and may properly be said to *rise again*, tho' it has not any the same Particles, yet when the Soul is separated from the Body, if that Body be dissolv'd, and *new* Particles be form'd into a Body and united to the Soul, it cannot be said to be the *same*, or to *rise again*. I appeal to the common Sense of Mankind.

I proceed now to shew in the *Second* place, that our Doctrine of the *Identity* of the Body in the Resurrection, is the Doctrine of the Primitive Fathers, the successors of Christ and his Apostles. The Fathers and ancient Writers of the primitive Ages, whose Testimonies I shall produce, are these which follow.

I. St. *Clement*, Bishop of *Rome*, the Companion and *Fellow-Labourer* of St. *Paul* the Apostle. In his First Epistle to the *Corinthians* he endeavours to convince that People of the possibility of the *Resurrection*, by the Example of the *Phenix*, which he says (according to the Opinion of those times) was produced out of the same Matter of which the dead one was compounded. He intimates that the *Phenix* was design'd by God Almighty as an Emblem of our Resurrection, to assure us that he will certainly raise us up. *Why therefore* (says

† Ὅπου δὲ
δὲ ἐρεῖ
δείκνυσιν
ὑμῶν τὸ
μεγαλεῖον
τῆς ἐπιγερ-
σίας, &c.

he) do we esteem it a great matter, and wonderful, that the Creator of all things should raise up all those that have serv'd him holily, † since by a Bird he manifests to us the magnificence of his Promise.

And tho' he makes use of several other Comparisons, yet he chiefly insists on this, as the most apposite, and is very long and particular upon it. Secondly, He endeavours to convince the Corinthians of the possibility of it, by representing to 'em the Almighty Power of God, and his Veracity, that nothing is impossible to him, but to lie, and the like. Thirdly, To prove the Doctrine of the Resurrection, he produces those Words of Job; *Thou shalt raise up my flesh.* I observe the Word *Flesh*. In the Greek Translation of the Book of Job it is *Skin*: This St. Clement thought fit to change, to express the thing more fully; and 'tis worthy to be observ'd, that when he changed the Word, he call'd it not *Body*, but *Flesh*. Fourthly, in his Second Epistle he has these Words: * *Let us*

* Καὶ μὴ
λαχέτω τις
ὑμῶν ὅτι αὐτὸς οὐκ ἔχει (ἢ καὶ κενὸν) τὸ πνεῦμα, (lege' ἔχοντα) ἐν
τῇ ἐσθλότητι, ἐν ᾧ ἀντιλαμβάνεται, εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ σφραγίδι αὐτοῦ. Δι-
ὅτι ἡμεῖς ὡς ἴσμεν οὐδὲν οὐκ ἔχοντες τὸ πνεῦμα. Ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦτο ἐν τῇ ἑ-
καστῇ ἐκλήθηται, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἑκαστῇ ἀντιλαμβάνεται. Ὁ ἰσχυρὸς Χριστὸς, ὁ μέγας, ὁ
σπουδαῖος ἡμῶν, ἐν ᾧ ἡμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα πνεῦμα, ἐν ᾧ ἐστὶν οὐκ ἔχοντες, καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ
ἐκλήθην. ὅπως καὶ ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι οὐκ ἔχοντες ἀπολαύμεθα τὸ μέγα.

one of you say, that this Flesh shall not be judg'd, nor rise. Do you know in what you were saved, in what you were convert- ed, unless it were in this Flesh? We ought therefore so to keep our Flesh as the Tem- ple of God. For as ye were call'd in the Flesh, so shall ye continue in the Flesh. The Lord Jesus Christ, who has saved us, be- ing first a Spirit, was made Flesh, and so call'd us: So we likewise in this Flesh must receive a Reward. I know this Second Epistle is by some suspected not to be St. Clement's: But as it is suspect- ed, so 'tis only suspected, not * proved; and this at least is certain, that it is ex- ceeding ancient.

* See Co-
telerius in
Scriptores
Apostol. p.
103, &c.

Having thus shewn what was St. Cle- ment's Doctrine, I shall now subjoin some few Remarks.

1. That the First Epistle was written by St. Clement, not in his own Name only (tho' his Authority alone were e- nough to demonstrate our Doctrine to be the Doctrine of the Church) but in the Name of the whole Church of Rome. This appears from the Title of it, and from the Testimony of St. (a) Irenæus, (b) Clemens Alexandrinus, (c) Eusebius, and others. Clemens Alexandrinus quotes it in one place, by the Title of *The Epistle of the Romans to the Corinthians*.

(a) Adv.
Hæc. l. 3.
c. 3.
(b) Strom.
l. 5. p. 586.
(c) Hist.
l. 3. c. 16.

K 4

2. That

(d) *Euseb.*
l. c.

2. That (d) in most Churches it was wont to be read together with the Canonical Scriptures, not only in *Eusebius's* time, about the end of the Third Century, but *παλαι* (as he himself asserts) in those Times which to him were the ancient Times. From hence it is evident, that the primitive Church in general profess'd the same Doctrine. It appears from (e) *St. Epiphanius*, that in his time, not only the First but the Second too was wont to be read in the same manner. *St. Clement* (says he) in his *Circular Epistles*, which are read in the Holy Churches, &c. And in the last of the *Canons* ascribed to the *Apostles*, the same is mention'd (together with the First) as part of the Canonical Scripture.

(e) *Har.*
30. Num.
15.

3. That *St. Clement* writes to the same Church to whom *St. Paul* had written before concerning the *Resurrection*. Now since he found that some of the *Corinthians* persisted still in their unbelief, notwithstanding what *St. Paul* had written to 'em, if the Doctrine of *St. Paul* and the Catholick Church had been only concerning a new *Ethereal* Body, he would have told 'em so in the plainest Terms that possibly he could, not have written so to 'em as plainly to intimate (if not assert) the quite contrary.

ry. Why are you so hard of believe? Has not St. Paul already told you, that the Body in the Resurrection shall not be the same *Humane Body*, as you imagine, but a new one and of a quite different kind?

4. It manifestly appears from this obstinate unbelief of some in that Church, that they did not understand St. Paul of a new *Ethereal Body*. That the Soul after Death is invested with an (a) *Eshe-*
real Body, was the common and receiv'd Opinion of the *Greeks* themselves, the *Pythagoreans* and the (b) *Platonists*. And though they commonly believ'd, that the Soul has an *Ethereal Body* or Vehicle, in its state of *Præ-existence*, and that it retains the same even whilst it is united to the *Humane Body*, and also after Death; yet they did not think it necessary that it should always be invested with the same which it had before its separation from the *Humane Body*. *Plato* asserts; that *The Soul will always have a Body, but sometimes of one Kind, and sometimes of another*. And *Porphyry* (d) affirms, that according as the Soul is affected, so it assumes a Body suitable to its present Condition; that being thoroughly purged, it assumes a Body of the purest Sort, the next in degree to *Immateriality*. And with that,

(a) See *Cudworth's Intellect. System. p. 785, &c.*
 (b) *St. Aug. de Civ. XX. 27. Plato Dixit sine corporibus animas in æternum esse non posse.*

(d) *Sent. c. 32.*

that, according to his Philosophy, it lives for ever in Heaven. The Conclusion is, that if the Apostles had intended not the same Body that died, but another *Ethereal* One, 'tis impossible that their Doctrine should meet with so great Opposition as it did. Was this the Doctrine that the *Corinthians* could not believe? Could that which their own *Philosophers* had taught 'em, seem so strange and *incredible* a Thing, when preach'd by the Apostles? It is plain from St. Paul, that the *Corinthians* to whom he wrote, thought the Resurrection a *strange and incredible Thing*; and after they had receiv'd St. Paul's Epistle, they still continued to think it so. They still thought it, as is evident from what St. Clement answers, *Μεγαλὸν καὶ θαυμάσιον, ἡ σύνθεσις τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ τοῦ σώματος*, a *strange and wonderful Thing*: Was the Union of the Soul to an *Ethereal Body* after Death, so strange and wonderful a Thing to the *Corinthians*, that they could not believe St. Paul, but forced St. Clement to write again (and again) to 'em to convince 'em? Was it for this that St. Clement to convince 'em was forc'd to insist so much on the *Almighty Power of God*?

If the Epistle ad *Tarsenses* were genuine, to St. Clement we might add St. Ignatius, who was constituted Bishop of *Antioch*

stock by the Apostles themselves. In that Epistle they who assert that

4 this flesh is not to rise, are reckon'd amongst the Ministers of Satan. But since that Epistle is spurious we must pass by Him, unless you will

grant that those Words of his concern-
ing his being condemn'd to be devour'd
by wild Beasts, had some respect to the
Resurrection of the Body. (4) *I am the
Wheat*, says he, *of God, and am ground
small by the teeth of Beasts, that I may be
found pure Bread.*

Ind. nigriceps. Loph. suprac. St. leucous adv. Nov. 1. 5. c. 28. ♂
 on Eagle. High 1. 3. c. 36

II. At the same time flourish'd *St. Polycarp*, who was Disciple to *St. John the Evangelist*. When he was bound to the Stake to be burn'd, He thank'd God, that he was now to suffer Martyrdom, and to partake of the Cup of Christ (b) in order to the Resurrection of everlasting Life, both of Soul and Body. You may read his Prayer in the Epistle of the Church of Smyrna, which is Extant in *Eusebius*.

III. At the same time also lived Papias Bishop of Hierapolis. (b) St. Irenaeus tells us that he was Disciple to St. John (the Evangelist) and a familiar Acquaintance of St. Polycarp's. This is certain

(c) that

(a) $\Sigma_{i=1}^n x_i$
 $\leq \sum_{i=1}^n y_i$
 $\leq \sum_{i=1}^n z_i$
 $\leq \sum_{i=1}^n w_i$

(b) Ap.
Euseb. Hist.
l. 14. c. 13.
Εἰς ἀνόστα-
σιν ζῶντες
ἀναστρέφοντες,
καὶ τὰς
ἐκκλησίας.

(c) See
Euseb. III.
39.

(c) that he liv'd in the time of those who had been conversant with the Apostles, and had made it his Business to collect the Doctrines of the several Apostles, from the Mouths of such as had convers'd with 'em. Now that He asserted the Resurrection of the same *Humane* Body Eusebius plainly intimates,

* Σωματικῶς τῆς ἐν
Χριστῷ βασιλείας ἐπὶ τῶν
ποσὶ τῆς γῆς ὑποστασά-
μεν. I. 3. c. 39.

(b) Schol. in Eccles. Hist.
c. 7. * Οὗτος γὰρ ὁ Πλάτων
ἐν τῇ περὶ τῶν ἀντὶ βί-
βλων τῆς χυρειακῆς ἐξου-
γίᾳ, τὰς διὰ τροφῶν
τῶν ἱερῶν ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει
ἀπολαύσεις. Vide St. I-
renæum I. 5. c. 33.

when he tells us, that accord-
ing to his Opinion * Christ is
to reign here corporally upon
Earth, after the Resurrection
from the Dead, a Thousand
Years. St. Maximus (b) af-
firms that he held, that after
the Resurrection we shall eat
and drink as before. Such an
Opinion as this could never
be built on mere Air. Whe-

ther true, or false, it plainly shews that
the Apostles did not preach the Resur-
rection of an *Airy* or *Ethereal* Body.

IV. The *Sibylline Oracles* publish'd by
some *Christian* not long after these times,
within about Thirty Years after St. John
the Apostle's Death, say, That God after
he has destroy'd the World and all mankind
by Fire, will restore their *Flesh* and *Bones*,

† Ὅσα καὶ
ἐσθλὰ ἦν
αὐτοὺς θεοῦ
ἔμπαλιν
ἀνδρα
μορφώσῃ, οἷον δὲ βροτῶν πάλιν ὡς πάλιν ἦν, &c. I. 4. ad finem.

and form 'em again as they were before.
And the † Verses, which tell us thus

much

much, are extant not only in the Volume which now we have, but also in the ancient (a) *Apostolical Constitutions*, (a) L. 5. where they are cited. c. 7.

V. St. *Justin Martyr*, who flourish'd in the Year 140, and was first instructed in the Christian Faith by one that was not only of *Man's Estate*, but of a considerable Age, when St. *John* was yet living, not only speaks in * several places of his Works of the *Rising Body*, as of the very same, and truly *Humane*, but in his Dialogue with *Trypho the Jew*, he gives him this Caution, that if he met with any that had the Name of Christians, but denied the Resurrection of the Dead, he should not esteem them Christians. For I (says he) and all those Christians, who in all respects hold the true Opinions, do know that there will be a Resurrection of the † *Flesh*. He says expressly *The Resurrection of the Flesh*. And the same Word he used in the Title of a Book, which he wrote professedly on this Subject: *Concerning the Resurrection of the Flesh*. They did not call it in those Days *The Resurrection of the Body*, because some of the Hereticks who denied the Resurrection of the *Flesh*, pretended however to believe the Resurrection of the Body; but that all might know

* Ad Gra-
cos Cohor.
p. 26.
Apolog. 2.
p. 57.

† Ἐγὼ δὲ,
καὶ οἱ ὅτινες
ἐστὶν ὁρθό-
γνομονες
καὶ μὴ
χριστιανοὶ
καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶν
ἀνάστασις
καὶ σώτηρ
ἐν ἡμῖν.

know that they intended the *Very same Humane Body*, they call'd it in down-right Terms *The Resurrection of the Flesh*.

VI. *Tatianus Syrus*, who was Disciple to *Justin M.* in his Oration against
(a) P. 146. *the Gentiles* (a): We shall be restored (says he) to what we are, and be judg'd by God the Creator. This we believe tho' you look upon us as silly triflers and babblers for it. For as once I had no being, and then was begotten, so being born, and again reduced by Death to what I was, I shall be restored to my being again. Tho' all my *Flesh* shall be consum'd by Fire, yet the *World* contains the evaporated Matter. Though I should be drown'd and dissolv'd in a River or the Sea, or be devour'd by wild Beasts, yet I am laid up in the *Repositories* of God. The Ignorant indeed and the Atheist know not where my Substance is reposit'd; but God who reigns, and who alone sees it, will restore it in his due Time to its former State.

VII. *St. Irenaeus*, who was born before the Death of *St. John*, and was Scholar to *St. Polycarp*, one of his Disciples, affirms that this was one of the Articles of the Creed receiv'd (b) by the
(b) L. 1. c. 2. Ec-
clesia per universum orbem usque ad finem terrarum seminata, & ab Apostolis & Discipulis eorum accepit eam fidem quae est in adventum Christi ad recapitulanda universa, & resuscitanda omniem Carnem humani generis.

Church

Church throughout the whole World to the ends of the Earth, from the Apostles and their Disciples, That Christ shall come and raise up all **Flesh**. And he spends a great part of his (4) Fifth Book in proving, against the *Hereticks*, that we shall rise perfect Men with the same Body of *Flesh*. ^{(a) C. 1. ad 16. & c. 31. &c.}

VIII. And to prove the same against the *Heathens*, is the whole endeavour of that excellent Treatise *Concerning the Resurrection of the Dead*; written by *Athenagoras*, the Christian Philosopher, who was Professor in the Divinity School of *Alexandria* in *St. Irenæus's* Time.

IX. *Athenagoras* tells us there were (b) ^{(b) P. 65. c} many that had written before him on this Subject; and that they were all asserters of the Doctrine of the *Identity* he plainly intimates. He takes no Notice of any thing in which they differ'd from him, but the *Reason* which they assign'd for the Resurrection. The same Author observes, that the Objection concerning one Man's feeding on another, was in those days a (c) ^{(c) Tais} common Objection against the Doctrine of the Resurrection. From thence it appears that the Doctrine of the *Identity* was the ^{πολλῶν ἐρεσµέναις διαπορέ- σις. p 43. D.} Common, and receiv'd Doctrine. He adds, that that Objection perplex'd even (d) ^{(d) some} some

(d) *Ibid.* (d) *some of those that were admired for their Wisdom.* This Doctrine therefore was the common and receiv'd Doctrine, not only of the *Vulgar*, but also of the *most Wise and Learned.*

X. *Theophilus* Bishop of *Antioch*, who flourish'd at the same time with *St. Irenæus* and *Athenagoras*, in his first Book to *Autolycus* (a *Heathen*) maintains the same Doctrine. (e) *But you deny* (says he) *the Resurrection of the Dead, and say, Shew me but one, that has risen from the Dead, and when I see him, I will believe. But what great Matter is it, if you believe when you see a thing done? Do you believe that Hercules, though he burnt himself, is yet living, and that Æsculapius revived after he was struck with the Thunder-Bolt, and yet disbelieve those things which are revealed to you by God? &c.*

XI. In the same Age, viz. in the Year 177, the Churches of *Vienna* and *Lions* wrote that Epistle to the Churches of *Asia* and *Phrygia*, which is extant in *Ensebins**, concerning their Persecutions. In that Epistle they complain, that their Persecutors would not suffer the Bodies of the Martyrs to be buried, but threw 'em to Dogs to be devour'd, and burn'd that, which remain'd undevour'd, to Ashes, and threw the *Ashes* into the River.

And

* *Hist.*
V. 1.

And † this (say they) they did, as if they could master God, and hinder their Resurrection, that (as they said) the Christians might not have any hopes of a Resurrection, through the belief of which they despised the greatest Torments, and came willingly and with joy to their

† Καὶ τ' ταῦ ἔπρα-
τον, ὡς ἠναγκάσθησαν
καὶ θείν, καὶ ἀπολύειν
αὐτῶν τ' παλιγγενεσίαν
ἵνα ὡς ἔλαβον ἐκείνοι με-
τ' ἐλπίδα ἡμῶν ἀνασ-
σεως, ἐφ' ἧς πεποιθότες,
ζήσῃν πάλιν καὶ κληθῶν ἡ-
μῶν ἐσπάρῃσι θρησκεί-
αν, εὖτε.

Deaths. Let us now see (say they) whether they will rise again, and whether their God can deliver 'em out of our Hands. The holy *Pothinus*, Bishop of the Church of *Lions*, who was martyr'd at that time, was not only born, but was almost of *Man's estate*, before *St. John* the Apostle's death.

XII. *Clemens Alexandrinus*, who flourish'd at the same time, tho' in those Works which are now extant he speaks but very little of the Resurrection, no where profess'dly, yet that he held the same Doctrine, may be gather'd from his Conjecture, * that *Plato* when he tells the Story of *Eris's* reviving after he had been dead Twelve Days, had respect to the Resurrection. * *Strom.*
l. 3. p. 599.

XIII. *Tertullian*, who flourish'd towards the latter end of this Second Century, has left us a whole Book concerning, and in defence of, this Doctrine,

entitled, *De Resurrectione CARNIS.*

* *De Virgin. Velandis*, c. 1. Regula quidem fidei una omnino est, sola immobilis

one of those * Articles of Faith which were receiv'd by the whole Church with one accord, and which were *immoveable and unalterable, That Christ shall come to judge the quick and the dead, and that by the Resurrection of the Flesh.*

& irreformabilis, credendi sc. in Christum venturum judicare vivos & mortuos per carnis etiam resurrectionem. Hac lege fidei manente, cetera jam disciplinæ & conversationis, admittunt novitatem correctionis.

De Præscript. Hæret. c. 13. Regula est autem fidei, ut jam hinc quid defendamus profiteamur, illa sc. quæ creditur — Christum venturum cum claritate, ad sumendos sanctos in vitæ æternæ, & promissorum cœlestium fructum, & ad profanos adjudicandos igni perpetuo, factâ utriusque partis resurrectione cum carnis restitutione.

XIV. The Compiler of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, who lived about the end of this Century, has a large † Chapter in defence of our Doctrine against the *Heathens*. God Almighty (says he) will raise us up through our Lord Jesus Christ, according to his Promise that cannot fail. And he will raise us up, together with all those that have died from the beginning of the World, || in the same form which now we have, without any mutilation or corruption. For we shall rise uncorrupted. For whether we die in the Sea, or have our Particles dispers'd in the Earth, or are devour'd by Beasts or Birds, He will raise

|| Τοῦτοις, ἐποιοῦν ὁ παρ' αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ γῇ νεκροὶ, καὶ ἐν ἁλλοῖς τοῖς, ἢ τῷ φθίσει.

raise us up by his Power, by which he holds the whole World in his Hand. Not a Hair, says he, of your Heads shall perish. — Through this certain † perswa- † P. 246.
 sion we endure Stripes, Persecutions, and Διδ. ὅ
 Deaths. And in vain have we endured ταύτην
 these things, if we have not full assurance ἡλ. ἡ
 of those things which we preach. — As
 God created the World, in the same man-
 ner he will raise us up by his good plea-
 sure, not standing in need of any assistance.
 For 'tis an effect of the same Power, to
 make the World, and to raise up the Dead.
 When Man had no Being, He made him of
 different Parts, giving him a Soul created
 out of nothing. And in the Resurrection
 he will restore to our Souls that do not die,
 their Bodies which are dissolv'd, &c.

XV. The Author of the Recognitions
 of St. Clement, who lived in the same Age,
 and is thought by * a very learned Man * Dr. Cave
 to be Bardeſanes of Syria, affirms, that Hist. Lit.
 the Souls in the Resurrection of the dead
 will receive || their Bodies that were dis- || L. 1. c.
 solv'd. 52. Ut in
 resur.

mortuorum cum corpora sua receperint, ipsa jam resolutione purgata;
 pro his quæ benè gesserant, æternâ hæreditate potiuntur.

XVI. About the middle of the same
 Age, Celsus, the great Adversary of the
 Christians, publish'd that Book, which

Origen in the following Age answer'd.

He disputes against this, as the receiv'd and avow'd Doctrine of the

(a) *Ap. Orig. l. 5.*
p. 240. Αὐταῖς οὐρεῖν
ἐκείναις ἀπὸ τῆ γῆς ἀνα-
στῆναι.

(b) Ὅτι μὴ οὐ μὲν
τῶν τῶ δόγμα καὶ τῶ χρι-
στianῶν ἐνίοις κοινὸν ἔστι.
καὶ τὸ σφόδρα μαρτυροῦν
αὐτῶ καὶ ἀποπτύειν αὐτὰ
καὶ ἀδύνατον ἀποδείξαι.

Christians, *That (a) the dead shall rise again out of the Earth with the very same Flesh.* 'Tis true he adds, that (b) *there were some even among the Christians that did not embrace this Doctrine, but shew'd it to be horridly impure, abominable, and impossible.* But what

sort of Christians those were whom he speaks of; that they were only such as were condemn'd as Hereticks, there is no one can doubt. We know that many of the *Hereticks* denied it, and wrote professedly against it; and it's usual with *Celsus*, to mention those as *Christians* without any note of distinction, who were even the vilest of *Hereticks*, and own'd by none of the *Orthodox*. He says, for example, in one place, that * *the Christians affirm that Christ did not really suffer, but only in appearance*: Which was only the Opinion of some of the *Hereticks*. In another place † he lays to the charge of the *Christians* a certain Opinion, which was only receiv'd by the *Ophiani*, a sort of *Hereticks* that were so far from being

* L. 2.
p. 70.

† L. 6.
p. 294.

ing *Christians*, that they hated Christ as much as *Celsus* himself, and never admitted any one into their Society but such as first *curs'd* him. Such as these perhaps, or not much better, were those who denied the Resurrection, as *impure and abominable*; such perchance of whom we may say, what *Origen* does in this latter case: See what absurdity *Celsus* is guilty of, who mentions those as of our Religion, who cannot endure to bear the Name of Jesus!

XVII. *Lucian* *, the noted Atheist, a Writer of the same Age, has these Words concerning the Christians: *Those Wretches persuade themselves, that they shall be the whole Man, (both Body and Soul) immortal, and shall live*

for ever. And on this account they condemn Death, and many of 'em offer themselves voluntarily to be put to Death.

XVIII. *Minucius Felix*, who lived in the beginning of the following Age, Who (says * he) is so foolish and brutish * as to deny, that God who first made Man, can form him again as he was before? 'Tis harder to make that which before had no Being, than to restore that which once had a Being. All Bodies when dissolv'd, whe-

* De morte Peregrini, p. 277. Πειράσας γὰρ αὐτοὺς οἱ κακοδαίμονες τὸ μὲν ὅλον ἀθάνατος ἔσθαι, καὶ βιώσθαι τὸ αὐτὸ χροῖον, παρ' ὃ καὶ καταφρονῶσι τὸ θάνατον, καὶ ἑκόντες αὐτοὺς ἐπιδικάζουσιν οἱ πολλοί.

* Othavio, p. 326.

ther crumbled to Dust, or dissolv'd into Moisture, or reduced to Ashes, or rarefied into Vapour, are lost to us, but to God, the keeper of the Elements, they are still preserv'd. He brings in his Heathen objecting against the Christians, that they believ'd this Doctrine of the Resurrection with so great and firm an assurance † as if they themselves had risen to Life.

† P. 97.
Renasce se
terunt

post mor-
tem & cineres & favillas: Et nescio quâ fiducia mendaciis suis invi-
cem credunt, putes eos jam revixisse.

XIX. The Author of the Book entituled, *Concerning the Cause of the Universe against the Heathens*, tells the Heathens, that God will raise us all up, not shifting the Soul out of one Body into another, but raising up the same Bodies. You, O ye Heathens, (says he) because you see that these Bodies are dissolv'd, do not believe that they will rise again. But learn you to believe. For since ye believe, according to Plato, that the immortal Soul was made by God, you ought not to disbelieve but that God is able to raise up to Life this Body which is compounded of the Elements, and to make it immortal, &c. The Author of this Book was either Caius, the Roman Presbyter, or St. Hippolytus; who both flourish'd in the beginning

ing of the Third Age. *St. Hippolytus* wrote a Book besides with this Title, *Concerning the Resurrection of the Flesh.*

We are now come down to the time of *Origen*, who left the receiv'd Traditions of the worthy Fathers his Predecessors, and endeavour'd to accommodate the Doctrine of the Resurrection to the Notions of the Heathen Philosophers. He himself owns that * *the Resurrection of the Flesh was the Doctrine* ^{* c. cels. l. 3 c. 242.} *preach'd in the Churches*: But he says that by the more wise it was not understood in so gross a sense as *Celsus* represented it. If he means that the Wiser and Learned sort of Christians did not believe that the same *Humane* Body is to rise, it appears from the foregoing Testimonies that that is not true. We have sought for Christ not among the ignorant Common-People, but among the *Doct'ors* in the *Temple*: And the Authorities which we have produced are those of the most Wise and Learned. But this was not *Origen's* meaning. He means only thus much, That the wiser sort understood that the *Flesh* in the Resurrection would not be just the same in quality with that which was buried, but would be alter'd for the better. Nei-

† P. 243. *ther we (says he, † in his Answer to Celsus) nor the holy Scriptures, say, that the Dead shall rise out of the Earth with the same Flesh, without any alteration for the better.*

Οὐτε μὲν
ἐν ἡμῶν,
ὅτι τὰ
ἐκ τῆς
σάρκός
αὐτῶν
ταῖς φρεσὶ
σφίσι, μὴ

διμῶν μεταβολὴν ἀνελκυσίαις † ἐπὶ τὸ βελτίον, ζήσονται, καὶ πάλαι ἀποθάνοντες, ἀπὸ † γῆς ἀνίστανται.

So firmly establish'd in the Church was the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the *same* Body, that *Origen* himself, tho' in some places of his Works he advances an Hypothesis not agreeable to it, yet in many other places he very plainly asserts it. In the Proem of his Books *περὶ ἀρχῶν*, where he reckons up the several Doctrines which were own'd to be certain and firmly grounded on the Tradition of the Church, he lays down this for one, That there shall be a time of the Resurrection of the Dead, when this Body that is sown in corruption, shall rise in incorruption. In the Second Book of the same Work, Chap. 10. where he treats professedly of this Doctrine, he disputes against the Hereticks that denied the Resurrection, after this manner: There are some (says he) especially among the Hereticks that are offended at the Church's Belief of the Resurrection, as if we believ'd foolishly and absurdly concerning it. To whom

whom we may answer thus. If even they themselves confess that there will be a Resurrection of the Dead, let 'em answer us this Question, what that is which died? Is it not the Body? The Resurrection therefore will be of the Body. Let 'em tell us besides, whether they think that we shall have Bodies in the Resurrection, or not? I think, since the Apostle St. Paul says, that it is sown a natural Body, and shall be rais'd up a spiritual Body, they cannot deny but that the Body is to rise, or that we are to have Bodies in the Resurrection. Now since it is certain that we are to have Bodies in the Resurrection, and the Bodies that sell are said to rise again (for nothing but that which sell, can properly be said to rise again) there is no doubt but that our Bodies are therefore to rise, that we may be again cloath'd with 'em. For this by a natural consequence follows from that. For if our Bodies rise again, without all doubt they therefore rise, that we may be again cloath'd with 'em. And if it be necessary that we should be in Bodies, we ought not to be in any other Bodies but our own. Now since it is true that they rise, and that they rise Spiritual Bodies, there is no doubt but that they are to rise again without their Corruption and Mortality: For it would be in vain for a-
ny

ny one to rise from the Dead, that he may die again. In his First Book Concerning the Resurrection, as his Words are produced by Pamphilus in his Apology, he thus disputes for it. Is it not absurd that this Body which bears the Scars of Wounds receiv'd for Christ's sake, and which, as well as the Soul, endured cruel Torments in Persecutions, and suffer'd the Punishments of Prisons, and Bonds, and Stripes, which was burnt by Fire, cut with the Sword, devour'd by Wild Beasts, tormented on the Cross, and many other ways, should be defrauded of the Rewards due to it for so great Sufferings? For does it not seem contrary to all reason, that the Soul which did not suffer alone, should be rewarded alone, and its Vessel, the Body, which serv'd it with great labour, should obtain no Reward of its Contentions and Victory? that the Flesh, which resists its natural vicious Inclinations and Lusts, and preserves its Virginity with a great deal of labour, which labour is more the labour of the Body than of the Soul, or at least full as much, should be rejected as unworthy in the time of Retribution, and the Soul only obtain the Crown. To the same purpose are those Words produced by St. Jerom: * We confess the Resurrection of Bodies, and of those too which were laid in the Graves, or

* Ad Pam-
machium
adv. Joan.
Hierosol.

or burnt to Ashes, that the Body of Paul shall rise, and be united to the Soul of Paul, and that the Body of Peter shall rise, and be his Body again, and so for all others. For it is not equitable that the Soul, which sinn'd in one Body, should be punish'd in another: Neither does it become a just Judge to reward a Body, when it was not that, but another which suffer'd for Christ. In his Second Book Concerning the Resurrection, he had these Words: † That the promise of the Resurrection of the Dead, is concerning this Body that ~~was~~, appears from many places of the Holy Scriptures, and particularly from the Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is styl'd the First-born from the Dead. In the same Book he adds, that it is certain that our Saviour arose with that very Body which he receiv'd from Mary. Again in the same. If the Bodies of Mankind be corrupted, they are able to exist again, being kept and preserv'd by the Power of God to the time of their Resurrection. Now that they are to be restor'd wheresoever they are, in whatsoever place they be, John thus declares in his Revelation: And the Sea gave up the Dead which were in it, and Death and Hell gave up the Dead which were in them. For by Sea there seems to be meant all Waters in
general

† Ap. Pam-
phil Apol.

Apud
Pamphi-
lum.

general ; by Hell the Air seems to be understood ; by Death the Earth. Innumerable other places (says Pamphilus) He has to this purpose in his Work Concerning the Resurrection. To these I shall add another out of the 28th Book of his Comments on Esaiah, on those words, *The Dead shall be rais'd up and they that are in the Graves, shall rise. It is better (says he) to say, that we shall all rise, that the Wicked may go into that place where is weeping and gnashing of Teeth, and the Just may receive, every one in his Order, according to the Merits of their good Deeds, when their mortal Bodies shall be fashion'd like to his Glorious Body.*——

By the Graves of the Dead here in this Place, and in many others, are to be understood, not only those which are made on purpose for the reception of the dead Bodies, either cut out in Rocks, or dug in the Earth, but all Places whatsoever, in which either the whole Body of a Man, or any part of it lies. And though it may happen that the several Parts of one and the same Body, may lie dispers'd in many Places, yet it is not absurd to call all those places in which any part of the Body lies, the Graves of that Body. For if we do not so understand it, they that are not bury'd in a Grave, but are drown'd in the Sea,

Sea, or lie expos'd in some desert Place, could not be reckon'd amongst those of whom it is said, That they shall be rais'd up out of their Graves. Which would be very absurd.

As he asserts in these Places the Resurrection of the Same numerical Substance, so in many other Places of his Works he plainly asserts, that the Body, when it rises, will be truly *Flesh*, and retain its old *Form* and *Shape*. His Apo-^{* Cod. 117. P. 293.}logist in ** Photius*, reckons this as one of those Tenets, which were falsely charg'd upon him, That he denied the *Resurrection of the Flesh*. So also his Apologist *Pamphilus*, who produces the following places to prove that he asserted it, in his *Comment on the First Psalm*:

† *As we retain (says he) the same species (of Body) from our Infancy to our old Age, though the Characters may seem to be much alter'd; so we ought to understand, that the very same Species which now we have, will remain in the Life to come, but chang'd very much for the better. For 'tis necessary that the Soul, which inhabits in Corporeal Places, should have such Bodies as are suited to those Places in which it lives. And as if we were to live in the Sea, our Bodies would be doubtless so order'd and constituted as is proper for such an Habitation, as the*
† The same place is produced by St. Metho- dius. ap. Epiphani. Har. 64. c. 14.
Bodies

Bodies of those Creatures are, which do there inhabit ; so now, since we are design'd for the Celestial Habitations, it follows that the qualities of our Bodies should be suited to the Glory of those Places. Notwithstanding this the former Species will not be destroy'd, though it be made more Glorious. For as the Species of the Lord Jesus, or of Moses, or of Elias, was the same in their Transfiguration with what it was before, so the Species of the Saints will remain the same though made more Glorious. In his Comment on the XVth Psalm, on those Words *My Flesh shall rest in Hope*: The Lord Jesus Christ, says he, speaks this, whose Flesh first rested in Hope. For being crucified and become the First-born of the Dead, and ascending up after his Resurrection into Heaven he carried up with him his **Earthly Body**, so that the Heavenly Powers were amaz'd and astonish'd seeing **Flesh** ascend up into Heaven. For of Elias it is written, that he was taken up as it were into Heaven ; and of Enoch, that he was translated, yet it is not said that he ascended up into Heaven. Let who ever will be offend'd with what I say : I confidently affirm, that as Christ was the First Born from the Dead, so he first carried up **Flesh** into Heaven. Hence they say, Who is this that
com-

cometh from Edom, i. e. from among those that are born on the Earth,) with Garments died Red from Bozrah? For they saw the Marks of the Wounds which were made in his Body: From Bozrah i. e. in the Flesh which he took upon him.

———A little after. Because my Flesh shall rest in Hope. In what Hope? not barely that it shall rise from the Dead, but that it will also be taken up into Heaven. Here Pamphilus deservedly cries out; What can be said by any one more evidently and clearly concerning the Resurrection of the **Flesh**? which he says will not only rise from the Dead, but will also be taken up into Heaven (if it were the Body of a good Man) following him who being the First Begotten from the Dead, first carried up the **Nature of Flesh** into Heaven. There were some that fancied that our Saviour ascended up in his Body no farther than to the Sun, and that there he left his Body. Which ridiculous Fancy they grounded on those Words of the Psalmist (according to the Greek) *In the Sun He placed his Tabernacle*. This Opinion was ascribed by some to Origen, but Pamphilus shews that he was so far from maintaining that Opinion, that he expressly opposes it, and confutes it. Pamphilus concludes his defence

defence of *Origen* concerning the *Resurrection*, with these Words : *Let them now cease to be Impudent, who say that Origen confesses indeed the Resurrection of the Body, but denies the Resurrection of the Flesh. Let them now leave off reproaching him when they see that he places the Flesh of God the Word in Heaven together with God the Word.* I shall not here take Notice of the *Dialogue against the Marcionites*, which is extant under *Origen's* Name, in which the Catholick Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Same Humane Body, is zealously asserted and maintain'd against those Hereticks. I do not take it to be *Origen's*. Yet 'tis certain that it is very ancient. There are some that reckon *Origen* among the Asserters of the *Millennarian* Doctrine, which Doctrine supposes a Resurrection of a true Humane Body : But I think it is a Mistake.

Quis hæc audiens, resurrectionem carnis eum negare putet ? So *St. Jerom*, after those Words of *Origen*, which I but now transcrib'd from him. Who would believe, that *Origen*, who in so many Places of his Works acknowledges the Resurrection of the Same Humane Body, should in others advance quite contrary Notions and Opinions ? Whatever *Pamphilus* alledges

alleges in his behalf, it is too too True that he did so. You desire me to give you a particular account of his Opinions relating to the *Resurrection*: *Huetius*, I remember, in his *Origeniana* treats largely of 'em: But I have not that Work at present by me. You must therefore be contented with what I have to present you of my own. In short they are These.

1. That in some places of his Works he advances this Opinion, That the Body in the Resurrection is made up of new Particles, by growing, as Corn does, out of a Seed, I have already shewn.

In the *First Canon* of the Council of *Trulla*, it is said that He, and his Followers, *Evagrius* and *Didymus*, spoke wickedly and contumeliously of the *Resurrection of the Dead*. *Aristinus* tells us more particularly, that they foolishly said, that these very Bodies that we now have are not to rise. They denied, says the *Anonymous Author De Synodis*, the *Resurrection of that Body which now we have*.

They taught, says another (a) *Anonymous* (a) *Ap. Lambecii. Notas in Codinum,*
Writer De Synodis, That our Bodies are not to rise.

Epiphanius (b) tells us that the Followers of *Origen* acknowledg'd the *Resurrection of the Dead*, and of our *flesh*,
 (b) *Anco- rat. c. 89.*

(d) Ibid.
c. 83.

and of the Body of our Lord, the same that was conceiv'd of the Virgin Mary ; yet they did not own that the same *Flesh* shall rise, but that another will be substituted by God in its Place. And the same (d) he says was the Opinion of the Hereticks call'd *Hieracites*, that there will be a Resurrection of the *Flesh*, but not of this which now we have, but another which will be substituted in its Place.

(e) De erroribus Origenis.

2. St. *Jerom* (e) says, that the Followers of *Origen*, when urg'd by the Catholicks, would acknowledge the Resurrection, not only of the Body, but also of the *Flesh*, and if they were press'd very hard and were ask'd whether they own'd the Resurrection of this same *Flesh* which we now have, which is seen, and touch'd, and walks and speaks, they would assent even to that too : But if they were ask'd whether they own'd that the Body in the Resurrection will have *Hands* and *Feet*, a *Belly*, *Breast*, *Teeth*, and the other Parts which make up a *Humane* Body ; that they denied.

|| Ad Pammach. adv.
Joan. Hierosol.

3. The same || Author tells us that *Origen* in many places of his Works, especially in his IV. Book Concerning the Resurrection, and in his Exposition of the First Psalm, and in his *Stromata*, denied that the Body will rise with *Bones*,
Blood,

*Blood, and Flesh, and such Parts and Members as now we have, or with difference of Sexes; and affirm'd that it will be Aereal, Ethereal, intangible, and invisible, and that whereas we now see with our Eyes, hear with our Ears, work with our Hands, and walk with our Feet; we shall then be all Sight, all Hearing, &c. That the Body will be Subtle and Ethereal, he asserts in his Comment on St. Matthew: And in his Second Book against * Celsus, we are told that the ^{p. 28.} Body of Christ after his Resurrection, was so constituted as to be of a middle Temper between the fineness of the Soul, and the grossness it had before his Death. St. Maximus likewise observes that in some of his Books (εἰς τὴν, so I read it, as a Manuscript has it, not εἰς τὴν, in one of his Books) he made the rising Body to be Ethereal.*

4. The Account which St. Methodius gives of his Opinion, is this: He tells us in one † place, that Origen taught, ^{† Ap. Epi-phan. Her. 64. c. 14.} That in the Resurrection we shall have the same species of Body, the same Form or Appearance, yet it will not consist of the same Matter; as our Bodies in old Age retain the same Species, yet have not any the same Particles which we had in our Youth. In another * place he says, that ^{* Ibid. c. 38.} Origen

Origen in his *Comment* on the *LXV. Psalm*, compared our Bodies to a *Bladder* full of *Water*; if you let the *Water* run, and keep pouring in new, the *Bladder* retains the same form, though the *Water* be all chang'd; so (says he) it is with the Body in the *Resurrection*, it is not numerically the same Body, yet the *Form* and *Figure* is the same, tho' made more *Glorious*.

|| *Ibid.* c.
15. &
Ap. Phot.
p. 923.

5. The same Author || adds, that according to *Origen*, tho' the Body in the *Resurrection* retains the same intire Species (or form) yet it throws off its earthly Qualities; and tho' it has the Shape and Figure of a Body of *Flesh*, yet it is not *Flesh*. And this (says he) he proves from that Assertion of *St. Paul*, that *Flesh and Blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of Heaven* (which is spoken only of the *Infirmities* and *Corruptions* of *Flesh and Blood*) and from other Texts of that kind.

* P. 923.

6. The same Author tells us, in * *Photius*, that *Origen* made the Body in the *Resurrection*, to consist of *Air and Fire*.

(a) *Ap.*
Photium,
p. 907.

7. From the (a) same and (b) other Authors, it appears, that he asserted with
(b) *Anastasiu Sinaita* in *Hexaem.* l. 11. p. 339. *Theophilus Alex.* *Epist. Pasch.* 3. p. 532.

the

the *Platonists*, that the *Body* is no part of the *Man*, but the *Soul* alone is the *whole Man*; and that the *Body* is the *Prison* * of the *Soul*, into which it is sent by way of punishment for some Sin it had committed in a state of Pre-existence.

* *St. Methodius & Theophilus Alex. loci cit.*
Epiphanius

Epist. ad Joan. Hieros. Vol. 2. p. 316.

8. Agreeable to this is that *Fansie* of his concerning the Creation of our first Parents, *Adam* and *Eve*, That they were created *nudæ mentes*, and had not any † *Bodies* 'till after their *Fall*; that then God cloath'd 'em with *Bodies* by way of Punishment. And this he says is meant by that place in *Genesis*, where 'tis said, *that unto Adam and to his Wife did the Lord God make Coats of Skins, and cloath'd them.* By *Coats of Skins* he understands *Bodies*.

† *Methodius ap. Photium, p. 910. & ap. Epiphanius. Her. 64. c. 17. ad 25. & c. 42.*
Epiphanius ibid. c.

63, 65, 66, & in *Ancorato*, c. 62. *Anastasiu Sinaita in Hexaem. l. 11. p. 338, Anonymus de Synodis. Alii.*

9. In his Books (a) against *Celsus*, he (a) L. 5. tells us that the reason why the *Body* P. 244. is to rise, and be united to the *Soul*, is because the *Soul* cannot move without a *Material Vehicle*.

10. In other places he tells us that the *Soul* is (b) never without a *Material* (b) *Methodius ap.*

Phot. See Cudworth's Intell. System, p. 818, &c.
M 3 rial

rial Vehicle, and that it is not capable of being rewarded or punish'd but in a Body, and that *before* the Resurrection it is rewarded or punish'd in an *Ethereal Body*.

II. In other places he proceeds so far as to deny that the Soul will after Death be united to any Body whatever, and to affirm that at the end of the World all *Corporeal Substance* will be perfectly annihilated. Photius * tells us that He, and his Followers, Evagrius and Didymus, asserted, that *our Bodies* are not to rise, but *our naked Souls alone* without Bodies. So also says † Constantinus Harmenopolus. And (a) Anastasius Sinaita intimates the same. We are told by (b) Leontius, that he own'd a Resurrection of the Body, but held withal that the Soul being punish'd in the Body, is purg'd by degrees, and at last freed wholly from it, and restored to its primitive state and condition. Theophilus Alexandrinus (c) assures us, that he made the *rising Bodies* corruptible and mortal; and asserted, that *after many Ages they will be annihilated*. That all *Corporeal Substance* will be at the end of the World annihilated, he affirms in several places of his Books *ἐν τῷ ἀρχαίῳ*, translated by St. Jerom in his

* *Epist. 1.*

† *De Scellis.*

(a) *In Hexaem.*

p. 339.

(b) *De Scellis.*

(c) *Epist. Pasch. 2.*

his Epistle to *Avitus*. So St. *Maximus** * In Eccl. Hierarch. c. 7. observes, that tho in some of his Books he taught a Resurrection of an *Ethereal Body*; yet in others he denied it, affirming that all corporeal Substance will be annihilated.

12. In one place of his Work *Ἐκείνου*, he tells us, that at the time of the Dissolution of the World, all Matter will be chang'd into the same Substance of which God himself consists. In the same he asserts,

13. That as soon as the World is dissolv'd, and all Matter annihilated, there will be new Matter, and a new World created just like this, and after that another, and so on to Eternity; and that before this World was created there had been innumerable others.

14. That in the next World he that is now a Man may be an Angel, and that which is now an Angel may be a Man, by being, for it's offences, thrust down into a Humane Body. If, after it is sent down into a Body, it does not behave it-self so as to deserve to be restor'd to its former State, it will then (says he) become a Devil; and according to its Merits, be employ'd in divers Offices in the other Worlds. if after this it desires to amend, and be-

come better, it is sent again into a *Humane* Body, and being there punish'd and purified, it at last becomes an *Angel*, as it was at first.

These were the Opinions of *Origen*, relating to the *Resurrection*; these his strange Contradictions and Inconsistences. How dangerous a thing it is in matters of Religion to forsake the Traditions of the Church, and to build upon ones own private Fancy, we may learn from his Example. If once you begin to indulge your own Fancy in Matters of Religion, without a due Regard to the Traditions of the *Primitive Church*, you know not where it will end. 'Tis odds but the *head-strong* Thing will at last, after many *Turns* and *Wanderings*, bring you to a *Precipice*.

No sooner were these Opinions advanced and publish'd, but the Church began to be alarm'd. *Liberatus Diaconus* affirms, that *Origen* was (a) condemn'd for 'em *in his life-time*. His Apologist *Pamphilus*, who flourish'd and wrote about the latter end of the same *Century*, tells us, that that which made the greatest Noise, and was chiefly oppos'd (b) was

(a) *Breviario* c. 23. *Origenes* damnatus, est mortuus, qui vivens olim fuit ante damnatus.

(b) Et

quoniam inter ceteras criminationes quas ei inferunt, est etiam, quam maximam ponunt, quod resurrectionem, scilicet mortuorum, denegeret.

his

his Opinion concerning the Resurrection. The same Author tells us that (c) several had written against him on that Subject. One of them was St. *Methodius*, (he whom I have several times quoted) Bishop of *Tyre*, who was martyr'd about the Year CCCIII. He wrote a Book with this Title *Against Origen, Concerning the Resurrection*: of which a great part is preserv'd in (d) *Epiphanius* and (e) *Photius*. The Opinion, which he opposes and confutes, is, *First*, That the Rising Body will not consist of the same substance that was buried: *Secondly*, That it will be not a Body of *Flesh*, but an *Ethereal* one. Another that wrote against *Origen Concerning the Resurrection* was *Antipater*, Bishop of *Bosra* in *Arabia*, who flourish'd long after, about the Year 460. A *Third* was (f) *Ammon Hadrianopolites*, whose Age I know not. To these I might add *Theophilus* Bishop of *Alexandria*, who writes against him in his *Paschal Epistles*; (g) *Epiphanius*, (h) *St. Jerom*, the Emperor (i) *Justinian*, and others.

(c) *Eos, qui etiam scripta de hoc edere adversus eum non pepererunt.*

(d) *Har. 64.*
(e) *Cod. 234.*

(f) Cited by S. *Maximus in celest. Hierarch.*
By the same Author in *Eccl. Hierarch. c. 7.*

p. 421. he is cited by the Name of *Olympius Hadr.*

(g) *Vide Har. 64. & Epist. ad Joan. Hierosol.*

(h) *Vide librum ejus ad Pammachium adv. errores Joannis Hierosol. & librum de erroribus Origenis.*

(i) *Vide Tractatum ejus Contra Origenem ad Mennam Patr. ap. Concil. to. 3. p. 675. & Epistolam ad Concilium v. Gen. ibid. p. 679.*

In

(c) Vide
Theophili
Alex. Epi-
stolas ad
Hierony-
num &
Epiphan-
nium.
 (d) *Cyri-*
lus Scy-
thop. Vita
Sabæ p.
364. 5.
 (e) *Ibid.*

In the Year 399, He, and his Opinions, were condemn'd and anathematiz'd by (c) a *Synod of Alexandria* under the Patriarch *Theophilus*; who at the same time expell'd all those that profess 'em out of *Egypt*. In the Year 400, he was condemn'd by a Synod call'd at *Rome* by P. *Anastasius*; after that by a (d) *Synod of Antioch* under the Patriarch *Ephræmius*; a little after, by a (e) *Synod of Constantinople* under the Patriarch *Menas*; and at last by a *General Council*, the *Fifth*, which was held in the Year 553.

I could easily fill you a Volume with the Testimonies and Authorities of the Doctors of the *Fourth* and the following Ages; and could shew you with how great a Zeal the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the *same Humane* Body has been always maintain'd by the Church: But I remember I am to send you, not a *Folio*, but a *Manual*; and I think the History of the *Resurrection*, which I have brought down through the Two first and purest Ages of the Church, to the time of *Origen*, may suffice to clear the truth of this *Article of our Faith*, by shewing that the Fathers of those Primitive times were *Seconds* to the *Apostles*, and abett the same Doctrine which we deduced from *Scripture*.

The

The later Doctors of the Church we will call all together to a *General Council* by their *Creeds*, and so seal our Doctrine with the great and Venerable Seal of the whole Catholick Church. We have shewn already from the Testimony of *Irenæus* and *Tertullian*, that in the Creed of the Catholick Church in their time, the *Resurrection of the Flesh* was one Article. It is so in that which is extant in the † *Apostolical Constitutions*. It is so likewise in that which we commonly call the *Apostles Creed*, which was generally believ'd even before the time of (a) *Ruffinus*, to have been written by the *Apostles* themselves. In our English Translation we read, *The Resurrection of the Body*; but in the Originals, the Greek and the Latin, it is, *The Resurrection of the Flesh*. So 'twas read, as (b) *Ruffinus* affirms, in all Churches. That the Latin Churches read *Carnis Resurrectio* appears not only from *Ruffinus*, but likewise from (c) *St. Jerom*, *St. Austin*, *Chrysologus*, and *Maximus Taurinensis*,

† L. 7. c. 42.

(a) Ex-
pos. in
Symb.(b) Cum
omnes Ec-
clesiæ ita
sacramen-
tum Sym-
boli tra-
dant, ut
postquam
dixerant
Peccato-

rum remissionem, addant, *Carnis Resurrectionem*. *Apol. adv. Hieron.*
See *Pearson on the Creed* p. 371.

(c) He intimates that it was so in the Creed of the whole Catholick Church: In *Symbolo fidei & spei nostræ*, quod ab *Apostolis* traditum, non scribitur in chartâ & atramento, sed in tabulis cordis carnalibus, post confessionem *Trinitatis*, & unitatem. *Ecclesiæ omne Christianæ dogmatis sacramentum, carnis resurrectione includitur.*
Adv. Joan. Hierosol.

whose

whose *Expositions* on the *Creed* are now extant, and from divers others, That it was *κατὰ ἀνάστασιν* *The Resurrection of the Flesh* in the *Creed* of the ancient Church of *Jerusalem*, is apparent from

(a) *Catech.*
cbesi 18.

(a) *St. Cyril* Bishop of that Church. It is so in the *Greek Creed*, which is extant at the end of *K. Ethelstan's Psalter* in *Sir John Cotton's Library*; and in that of the *Bodleian Library* which is written in *Saxon Characters*, at the end of the *Acts of the Apostles*; a Manuscript of above a *Thousand Years* old. In the Church of *Aquileia* they had one Word peculiar to themselves. For instead of *the Resurrection of the Flesh*, they read, to make it more exprefs, (because some of the *Origenists* would talk of a new *Flesh*)

(b) *Rufinus.* See
Pearson
p. 371.

(b) *The Resurrection of this Flesh.*

The several Councils which were call'd in the *Fourth Century*, relating chiefly to the Controversies of the *Arians*, the *confessions of Faith*, which they publish'd, have not, for the most part, any thing exprefs concerning the Resurrection of the *Flesh*. The *Nicene Creed*, and those of most of the Synods of that Age, exprefs only thus much: That Christ will *Come to judge the Quick and the Dead*. But that the Resurrection of the *Flesh* was the Doctrine of the Council of *Nice*,

Nice, may particularly appear from that *Confession* which the Heretick *Arius*, and the rest of his Party of *Alexandria*, presented to the Emperor *Constantine*, after they had been condemn'd by that Council, to perswade him that they were truly Orthodox, and came up fully to the Doctrine of the Council. In that (a)

Confession it is *eis oupous anastaton*. So also in the *Confession* (b) of the Synod of *Antioch*, and in that of (c) *Marcellus* Bishop of *Ancyra*. And in that of the Eighty (d) Eastern Bishops who sided with the *Arians* at *Sardica*.

(a) *Socr.*
1. 26.
Socr. 11.
27.
(b) *Socr.*
11, 10.
(c) *Epi-*
phan. Har.
52. c. 3.
(d) *Ap. S.*

In the *Creeds* of the *Second* and *Sixth* General Councils, and in that which in the time of * *Epiphanius* was wont to be recited by the Converts that were to be baptized, it is only, *The Resurrection of the Dead*. In that ascribed to St. *Athanasius* we profess that *all Men shall rise again with their Bodies*. That of P. *Damasus* delivers it thus: † *We believe that we shall be rais'd up in the same Flesh in which we now live*. I need not mention || that of St. *Jerom*. What his Belief was, appears sufficiently from the seve-

Hilarii
Fragmen-
ta, p. 440.
* *Ancorato*,
c. 121.

† *Ap. Op.*
B. Hie-
ron. to.
4. p. 66.
In hujus
morte &

sanguine credimus emundatos nos & ab eo resuscitandos die novissimo in hac carne qua nunc vivimus.

|| *Ibid.* p. 67. Resurrectionem etiam carnis confitemur, & credimus, ut dicamus nos in eadem in qua nunc sumus veritate membrorum esse reparandos, qualesque semel post resurrectionem fuerimus effecti, in perpetuum permanuros.

ral

ral places where I have already cited him. He is positive in this, that it is not possible to understand the Doctrine of the Resurrection as profest by (a) the *Catholick Church*, any otherwise than of a true *Humane Body*.

(a) Adv.
Joan. Hierosol. Ego
liberè di-

cam, & quanquam torqueatis labia, rathatis capillum, applaudatis pede, Judæorum lapides inquiratis, fidem *Ecclesia* apertissime confitebor. *Resurrectionis* veritas *catholica*, sine carne & ossibus, sine sanguine & membris intelligi non potest.

Ruffinus in the same Age, being suspected with *John* Bishop of *Jerusalem*, as favouring the Opinion of *Origen*, to clear himself, and the Bishop, from that Scandal, makes this Profession of Faith in his own and the Bishop's Name, in the Preface to his *Translation of Pamphilus's Apology for Origen*. (b) *We be-*

(b) Nos
autem, si-

cut traditum est nobis à sanctis patribus, retinemus quod filius Dei in eâ ipsâ carne in quâ passus est, resurrexit à mortuis, propter quod & resurrectionis spem humano generi tribuit. Carnis verò resurrectionem non per aliquas præstigias, sicut nonnulli calumniantur, dicimus: Sed hanc ipsam carnem in quâ nunc vivimus resurrectionem credimus, non aliam pro aliâ, nec corpus aliud quàm hujus carnis dicimus. Sive ergo corpus resurrectionem dicimus, secundum Apostolum dicimus, hoc enim nomine usus est ille: Sive carnem dicimus secundum traditionem Symboli confitemur. Stulta enim adinventio calumniæ est, corpus humanum aliud putare esse quàm carnem. Sive ergo caro secundum communem fidem, sive corpus secundum Apostolum dicitur quod resurget, ita credendum est sicut Apostolus definit, quia quod resurget in virtute, resurget & in gloriâ, & incorruptibile resurget, & spiritale corpus, quia corruptio incorruptionem non possidebit. Salvis ergo his prerogativis futuri corporis vel carnis, resurrectio carnis credenda est integre atque perfectè, ut & natura carnis eadem servetur, & incorrupti ac spiritualis corporis status & gloriâ non infringatur. Sic enim scriptum est. Hæc in Hierosolymis in Ecclesiâ Dei à sancto Sacerdote ejus Joanne prædicantur, hæc nos cum ipso & dicimus & tenemus. Si quis præter hæc vel credit, vel docet, vel à nobis aliter credi quam exposuimus putat, anathema sit.

lieve,

lieve, as it has been deliver'd down to us from the Holy Fathers, that the Son of God arose from the Dead in the very same Flesh in which he suffer'd, by which he gave us also hope of a Resurrection. We speak of the Resurrection of the Flesh not in a shuffling and deceitful manner, as some falsely accuse us, but we believe that this very Flesh, in which we now live, shall rise, not another instead of it, neither do we mean any other Body besides this of Flesh. If therefore we say that the **BODY** shall rise, we speak according to the Apostle, for he useth that Word: If we say that the **FLESH** is to rise, we make our Confession according to the Tradition of the Creed. 'Tis a foolish thing to accuse us as if we thought a Humane Body could be any thing besides Flesh. Whether therefore that which shall rise be called **FLESH**, according to the Creed, or **BODY**, according to the Apostle, it is so to be believ'd as the Apostle has set it forth, that that which shall rise, shall rise in Power and Glory, and shall rise an Incorruptible, and a Spiritual Body, that Corruption shall not inherit Incorruption. Saving therefore these Prerogatives of the Body or Flesh in the other Life, the Resurrection of the Flesh is to be believ'd wholly and perfectly, so that both the same nature of
Flesh

Flesh may be retain'd, and the state and glory of an incorrupted and spiritual Body may not be violated. For so it is written. These things are preach'd in Jerusalem in the Church of God by the holy Bishop John. These things I, together with him, profess and maintain. If any one either believes or teaches any other Doctrine, or thinks that we believe any other than this we have now set forth, let him be accurs'd.

* Resurrectionem verò futuram humanæ credimus carnis.

The same Council: Si quis dixerit vel crediderit corpora humana non resurgere post mortem, anathema sit.

† Resuscitandi ab eo in quâ nunc vivimus carne; & in eâ quâ resurrexit idem Dominus formâ.

himself rose. That of the Eleventh Council of the same Church in the Year

(a) Hoc ergo exemplo capitis nostri confitemur veram fieri resurrectionem omnium mortuorum. Nec in aerea, vel, quâlibet aliâ carne surrecturos nos credimus (ut quidam delirant) sed in istâ quâ vivimus, confitemur, & movemur.

*The Creed of the * First Council of Toledo, in the Year 400 has thus: We believe there will be a Resurrection of the Flesh of Mankind. That of the Fourth Council of Toledo in the Year 633. † We are to be rais'd up by Christ in the same Flesh in which we now live, and in the same Form in which he*

675. (a) According to the Example of our Head, (i. e. Christ) we confess that there will be a true Resurrection of the Flesh of all the Dead. Neither do we believe that we shall rise in an Aereal or any other kind of Flesh, (as some have

have deliriously fancied) but in that in which we live, have our being, and move. Boetius in his Confession of Faith: (b) This is principally requir'd in our Religion, that we believe, not only that our Souls do not perish, but also that our Bodies themselves which are dissolv'd by death, are restored in the life to come to their former state.

(b) Et hoc est principale religionis nostræ, ut credamus, non solum animas non perire, sed ipsa quoque corpora, quæ mortis adventus resolverat, in statum pristinum futurâ beatitudine reparari.

Vigilius Tapsensis: (c) If any one says (c) L. 5. that a Man will not rise in the Day of Judgment in the Body, as God made him, let him be accurs'd.

De Trin. ter op. S. Athanasii. Si quis confitetur

quod Deus animam hominis tantum fecerit, & Satanas ei corpus plastaverit, quod abfit, anathema illi. Si quis confitetur animas hominum in revolutionem rursus in mundo, aut in hominibus, aut in pecudibus, aut in serpentibus reverti, anathema illi. Si quis confitetur hominem in animâ tantum in diem judicii, resurgere, & nō cum corpore, quemadmodum Deus illum fecit, anathema illi.

To conclude, tho' the Church of England in the vulgar Translation of the Apostles Creed, uses only these Terms, *The Resurrection of the Body*, yet in her Form of Publick Baptism, the Person to be baptized is askt, in his Representative the Godfather, *Dost thou believe the Resurrection of the Flesh?*

I have now ——— But I cannot yet say, I have now done. Before I put an end to this History, I shall crave your leave

to offer to your Consideration, what I had almost forgotten, an Observation, or two, relating to some of those Primitive Writers whose Authorities we have above produced.

My first Observation is this, That the greatest part of 'em were not only bred up in the Prejudices and Infidelity of the Heathens, but were likewise by Profession *Philosophers* and *Lawyers*: And what Opinion the *Philosophers*, and learned *Greeks* had of the Doctrine of the Resurrection, as profest by the Christians, is very notorious. I have shewn in the beginning of this Discourse, that even among the *Greeks* there were many Opinions which were founded on an ancient Tradition concerning the Resurrection, and that it was in some sense believ'd by many of their *Philosophers*: Notwithstanding it is certain, that, as it was understood by the *Christians*, it was by all the *Greeks* in general exploded. Not any one Christian Doctrine so generally, and with so much contempt, rejected. *There was not any one Sect* (says * *Tertullian*) *among all the Philosophers, but what denied it.* They did *παντι αντιτασσουσ τετρα*, with all imaginable opposition, contend against it, says the

* Ut carnis resurrectione negetur de unum omnium Philosophorum Scholâ sumitur.

Author of the *Questions and Answers ad Græcos*. Thus St.

(b) *Austin* affirms that *there was nothing in the Christian Religion, so vehemently, so pertinaciously, and with so much contention and earnestness opposed as the Resurrection of the Flesh. Of the Immortality of the Soul* (says he) *many of the Heathen Philosophers have discoursed at large. And in very many of their Writings they assert it. But when they come to the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Flesh, they do not so much as hesitate about it, but vehemently oppose it, and they say that 'tis impossible that this earthly Flesh should ascend up into Heaven.* (c) *Pliny* affirms that 'tis beyond the Power even of God himself to raise up a Body to life when once it is dead. And 'tis (d) *Madness* to him to believe there will be any such thing. To *Celsus* this Doctrine seem'd *abomina-*

(b) In nulla re tam vehementer, tam pertinaciter, tam obnixè, & contentiosè contradicitur fidei Christianæ, sicut de carnis Resurrectione. Nam & de animi immortalitate multi etiam Philosophi Gentium multa disputaverunt, & immortalem esse animum humanum, pluribus & multiplicibus libris conscriptum reliquerunt. Quum ventum fuerit ad resur. carnis, non titubant, sed apertissimè contradicunt & contradictio eorum talis est, ut dicant fieri non posse, ut caro ista terrena possit in cælum ascendere. *Expos. Psal. 88.*

(c) *Hist. Nat. l. 2. c. 7. Imperfectæ verò in homine naturæ præcipua solatia, ne*

Deum quidem posse omnia. Namque nec sibi potest mortem consciscere, si velit, quod homini dedit optimum in tantis vixæ poenis: Nec mortales æternitate donare, aut revocare defunctos; nec facere, ut qui vixit, non vixerit, &c.

(d) Vide supra ubi de Democriti dogmate.

* Ἀπό-
πυεν αρ.
Orig. l. 5.
p. 240.
(a) Cont.
Jul. l. 7.
ad finem.
(b) "Ο
μάλιστα
διαλασ-
πες τις
ἄλλοις ἄ-
πειν.
(c) Χλευ-
αζεν, l. 5.
c. 7.
(d) c.
Cels.
ἐρυλαί-
ου γαλαί-
ου ἑπὶ
ἀπὸ τῶν.
(e) Fabu-
los aniles
(f) Πάρυ
οληνάους
χ' ἀπὸ
μαλόνος,
p. 146.

ble, or * *worthy to be spit at*, as extrem-
ly impure. (a) St. Cyril of Alexandria
tells us, that the Emperor Julian (b) de-
rided this above all the Tenets of the
Christians. They (c) *mock'd* at it, says
the author of the *Apostolical Constituti-*
ons. And Origen (d) says it was a com-
mon subject of Laughter. Cecilius in Mi-
nucius Felix calls it (e) *an old Wife's*
Tale. And Tatian assures us, that the
Heathens were wont to look upon the
Christians as (f) *pitiful Triflers and Bab-*
blers for asserting it. My conclusion is
this: That if the Doctrine of the *Iden-*
tity, or Resurrection of the very same
Body, had not been lookt upon in those
Primitive Times as firmly establish'd on
the Authority of Christ and his Apostles,
if it had been look'd upon only as a
Scholastical Doctrine, or a *Dogma* that
might be dispensed with, those learn-
ed and acute Men (of whom we speak)
when converted from their *Heathenism*,
would never have embraced it, as I
have proved they did.

In the Second place it is worthy to
be observ'd, that those Books out of
which I have taken their Testimonies,
were many of 'em written professedly
in Answer to the Objections of the Hea-
then Philosophers. And if the Doctrine
of

of a new *Ethereal* Body, which *Origen* afterwards made bold to advance, could have been warranted by the Scripture, and the Traditions of the Apostles, how gladly would those Fathers have taken hold of it! That the Soul is never without an *Ethereal* Body, was (as we have already observ'd) a common Opinion of the *Greek* Philosophers: Now how easie had it been for those Fathers to answer all the Cavils and Objections and *Flouts* of their insulting Adversaries, by proposing this Notion! How easie had it been to remove that great Stumbling-Block which lay in their way to Christianity! They were too learned and too acute Philosophers, not to think on it; but they knew it was not agreeable to the Doctrine deliver'd to the *Saints*.

Perhaps it may be alledged, that the Reason why the Primitive Fathers believ'd the Resurrection of the same *Humane* Body, was because they believ'd that after the Resurrection Christ is to come upon *Earth*, and the *Saints* are to abide with him here a Thousand Years.

Perchance you may be apt to suspect, that this was the chief Foundation of that gross Notion which they so generally entertain'd of the *rising* Body.

To remove such a Suspicion as that is, I need only tell you, that not only the Patrons of the *Millennarian* Doctrine, but such also as rejected that Doctrine, asserted the Resurrection of the same *Human* Body.

Tho' many of those ancients whose Authorities we have produced, asserted the *Millennium*, such as *Papias*, the Author of the *Sibylline Oracles*, *Justin M.*, *Irenaeus*, *Tertullian*, and *Hippolytus*: Yet others there are amongst 'em, that did not embrace that Doctrine. It does not at all appear, that either *St. Clement of Rome*, or *St. Ignatius*, or *Theophilus of Antiach*, or *Tatian*, or *Minucius Felix*, were asserters of it. On the contrary it appears that the wise and learned *Athenagoras* did not believe it. I observe that he asserts, that after the Resurrection there will be no such Things as *Inanimate Beings*, which is plainly repugnant to the Doctrine of the *Millennium*. In his Discourse of the Resurrection, he argues after this Manner: If God (says he) is unwilling to raise the Dead, it is either because it is Unjust, or because it is Unworthy. But it is not Unjust, for if it be so, it must be an Injury either to those that are rais'd, or to some other being. It cannot be an Injury to any other Being: For Intellectual

al Beings (or Angels) are not at all dam-
nified by it, (a) neither can it
be an Injury to Irrational or In-
animate Beings : For after the
Resurrection there will be no such
Beings. And to that which is
not, there can be no Injury done.

But admit that there should be
such things then in being, yet the Resur-
rection of Mankind would be to them no
Injury, &c. Neither was Clemens Alex-
andrinus an asserter of the Millenium :
I know it is suspected by some learned
Men that he was : But that he was not,
I gather from a place in his Treatise con-
cerning the Salvability of Rich
Men. He was (b) made (says
he, speaking of the young-
Man re-converted by St. John)
a Trophy of the Resurrection
that is hoped for, when in the
end of the World the Angels
shall carry up those, who are truly Peni-
tent, to the Supercelestial Habitations.

I have now done with my History and
Proofs of the Doctrine of the Resurre-
ction. And by this time, I hope, you
are so well satisfied of the Truth and
certainty of it, as to be ready to ask
me that Question of St. Paul : How say
some among You that there is no Resur-

(a) Οὐ μὴν ἔστι τι
ἀλόγων ἢ θύσης, ἢ δὲ τῶν
ἀψύχων· ἡ δὲ γὰρ ἔστι με-
τὰ τῆς ἀνάστασιν· πρὶν
οὐδὲ τὸ μὴ ὂν, ἢ ἐν ἀδι-
κῶν· εἰ δὲ καὶ εἶναι τις ὑ-
ποθέσῃτο διαπαντός, &c.
p. 204. Ed. Oxon. 1682.

(b) Τροπαῖον ἀναγέρ-
σθαι ἐλπίσμενης, ὅταν ἐν
τῇ συντελείᾳ τῆ αἰωνίου,
οἱ ἀγγέλοι τῆς ἀληθείας
μαθησκόντες διέξωνται εἰς
ἐπεφάνης σκηνάς. p. 18.
Ed. Oxon. 1683.

Objections answered

(184)

rection ? The *fourth* and last thing I propos'd to do, was to answer the Objections of such as say, *there will be no Resurrection*. And this I shall now in the next place endeavour to do.

The First Objection is taken from the Difficulty of it. There are not only many Men whom Necessity and Famine have forc'd to devour one another, but there are many whole Nations in the World that are wont to feed ordinarily on *Humane* Flesh. You may add that we are all in some sense *Canibals* and *Man-eaters*, we devour one another, we eat our dead Neighbours, our Brothers, our Fathers, the succeeding Generation swallows down the former, though we prey not upon 'em, in the same manner, as some other *Canibals* do, yet, by a subtle *Cookery* of Nature, we eat 'em at *second Hand*. This is true in some Measure : From the Bodies of the Dead springs up *Grass*, this when eaten by the Ox, is turn'd into *Flesh*; this we eat, and the *Flesh* of the Ox becomes *ours*. *Plutarch* (a) tells us that when the *Cimbrians* were defeated by *Marinus*, there fell so great a Number of 'em that the whole Field was *dung'd* (as one may say) with their dead Bodies, and afforded the next Season an extraordinary

(a) *Vita
Marin.*

ry

ry rich and plentiful *Crop*. Others tell us of a certain *Roman* who fed his Fishes with the Bodies of his Slaves, whom he threw into his Ponds, that he might feed at second Hand on *Man's* Flesh. Now since the substance of one Man's Body, becomes the substance of another Man's Body, how (you will say) can the Bodies of both be rais'd again ?

This Objection is a very considerable one, and has been all along urg'd against the Doctrine of the *Resurrection*, not only by our later *Scepticks* but anciently (as I but now observ'd) by the Heathen Philosophers. I shall not deny, as *Athenagoras* seems to do, that the substance of one Man's Body, when eaten by another, turns to nourishment and becomes the Flesh of that other that eats it. It sufficiently appears that they that eat *Humane* Flesh to satisfy their Hunger, are reliev'd and cherish'd, and, of consequence, nourish'd by it. But my Answer is this :

That God Almighty who has engag'd his Promise that the Bodies of all Men shall rise again, will take care so to order all things relating to our *Nourishment*, as that that may not hinder his Promise from being fullfill'd. He will take care that the Particles of One Man's
Body

Body shall never so become the Particles of another Man's Body, as that the Resurrection of either should be thereby render'd impossible. 'Tis an Observation of the most accurate *Sanctorius*, grounded on infallible *Statick* Experiments, that not above the *Fiftieth* Part of what a Man takes into his Body turns to Nourishment. From hence I make this following Inference :

Should an Ox, for Example, feed only on such Grass as grew in that Field which was impregnated by the Dead Bodies of the *Cimbrians* (but now mention'd) as the Grass would not consist wholly of those Particles which belong'd to the dead Bodies, but would chiefly consist of other more common Particles, those of *Rain* and the like, so not above the *50th* Part (perhaps a much less proportion) of the Grass which is eaten, would become the Flesh of the Ox, and not above the *50th* Part of that Flesh of the Ox which is eaten by a Man, would be turn'd into the Substance of the Man. Should a Man feed on *Corn* that grew in such a Field, as the Corn would consist not wholly of the *Humane* Particles, but chiefly of others; so not above the *50th* Part of the Corn so eaten would become the Flesh of him that ate it. The same

same may be said of him who fed his Fishes with the Bodies of his Slaves: As the Fish must be suppos'd to receive their Nourishment from those Bodies, not wholly, but only in part, so not above the 50th part of the Substance of the Fish (you may say much less, considering the unfitness of Fish for Nourishment) would become the Flesh of the Eater. It is plain, that even according to the common course and nature of Nutrition, were there no particular Providence concern'd in the matter, there would be in such Cases but very few Particles in any Man's Body which belong'd before to another. Should one Man devour another wholly (in this the great Strength of the Objection lies) it appears from *Sanctorius's* Observation that not above the 50th part of the Flesh of the Person devour'd would become the Flesh of him that ate it. And besides the other 49 parts of the Flesh, there would remain all the *Bones* untouched, which make up a great (the most substantial) part of the Body.

It is further to be consider'd, that though the same Body that died is to rise again, yet it is not necessary that all the Particles of it should be *rais'd up*. 'Tis enough that such Particles are *rais'd*

as made up the *integral* and *necessary* Parts of the Body. By *necessary* Parts, I mean those which remain after the utmost degree of *Maceration*, without which the Body would not be *Integral*, but *Imperfect*. And these are chiefly the *Bones*, the *Skin*, the *Nerves*, the *Tendons*, the *Ligaments*, and the Substance of the several Vessels. As long as these, and all that are necessary to Life, remain, the Body is truly *Whole*, though never so much macerated. All the *Flesh* that is added makes nothing at all to the *Wholeness* or *Integrality* of the Body, tho' it conduce to *Strength* and *Ornament*. And this is that *Flesh* which would chiefly turn to *Nourishment* if the Body were devour'd. The Substance of the Vessels, *Tendons*, &c. are not so apt for *Nourishment*. If the *dying* Body be extremely *macerated*, I do not doubt but that in the *Resurrection* it will be restor'd by foreign and adventitious Matter to its due and just Proportion. So in Bodies that are *full* and *fleshy*, there's a great deal of substance that is not *necessary*, which if it become the *Flesh* of another Man, the Body may be rais'd up without it, and yet be still *Physically Whole* and truly the *same*. In Bodies that are *Fat* and *Grass*, there is doubtless a great deal

deal superfluons, which will never be rais'd up, though it were never made the *Ingredient* of another Man's Body. To sum up all in a word : I say that God Almighty, who has promis'd that the Bodies of all Men shall be rais'd up again to Life, will so order all things relating to our *Nourishment*, as that those Particles, of which the *necessary* Parts of one Man's Body were compounded, shall never become the Particles of the *necessary* Parts of another Man's Body : At least he will take care that they may not continue to be so at the time of his *Death*.

If Providence has decreed that not only the *necessary* Particles, but that *all* the Particles of the dying Body shall be rais'd up again, it will take such care of our *Nourishment*, as that the Particles of one Man's Body shall never continue to be part of another Man's Body at the time of his Death. God will take care that no one shall die whilst his Body contains any Particles that belong to another. But (as I said) it is not at all necessary that we should believe thus much.

Mr. Boyle in his *Treatise concerning the Possibility of the Resurrection*, in answer to this Objection, which we have now examin'd, alledges, that it is not necessary
that

that any of the same *Flesh* should be rais'd up: 'Tis enough, he says, if the *Bones* are rais'd up and cloth'd with new *Flesh*. And this he proves from the Prophet *Ezekiel's* Description of the Mystical Resurrection, where (says he) only the same *Bones* were rais'd up, and the *Flesh*, &c. was made up of new Matter. But how does it appear that in that Resurrection the *Flesh* is to be understood to be made up not of the former, but of new Particles?

He alledges moreover that the Body, which rises, may be said to be the same with that which was buried, though it contain in it but a very small part of the same Substance. He observes that St. Paul's comparing the Resurrection to the growing of Corn, seems to justify the supposition of a Plastick Power in some part of the matter of a deceased Body, whereby, being Divinely excited, it may be enabled to take to it self fresh Matter, and so subdue and fashion it, as thence sufficiently to repair or augment it-self. This is wholly the Hypothesis of Origen. He adds, that the Alcalifate Ashes of a certain Plant like our English red Poppy, being sown in a Garden, has been known to produce certain Plants larger and fairer than any of that Kind that had been seen in those Parts

Parts. Which seems, says he, to argue, that in the saline and earthy, *i. e.* the fixt Particles of a Vegetable, that has been dissipated and destroy'd by the Violence of the Fire, there may remain a Plastick Power enabling them to contrive dispos'd Matter, so as to re-produce such a Body as was formerly destroy'd. However to this Plastick Power, residing in any Portion of the destroy'd Body itself, he is not willing to have recourse. He rather believes, that God by his Omnipotence will perform the thing, and work up some of the Particles of the deceas'd Body, together with the adjacent Matter, into a Humane Body. And the Body which is so work'd up may be call'd (as he tells us) the *same* Body.

This is not to defend the Doctrine of the *Resurrection*, but to give it up to it's Adversaries, and to advance another Doctrine instead of it. For it is not true that a Body so made up, may be call'd the *same* with that which died. How can a Grain of Corn, that is grown up, be said to be the *same* with that which was sown? I have own'd already that the *Identity* of our Bodies in this Life, does not consist in the *Identity* of Particles: I have granted that our Bodies in our *old* age are the *same* with those which we had when *Infants*, or in
our

our Mothers Womb, tho they have not in 'em any one Particle the same. But I said withall, and the same I say here again, that it does not therefore follow that the rising Body may be the *same* with that which was buried, tho it have not any, or but few, of the same Particles. The *Identity* of the Body here in this Life consists in a fit Construction and Organization of successively fleeting Particles of matter. The *Identity* of the *Rising* Body, or it's *sameness* with that which died, can consist in nothing else but in the Restoration of the same Particles of Matter, which made up the *necessary* Parts of the *dying* Body, to their former Construction. (22)

Another Objection concerning the Difficulty of the Resurrection, is this: We are told by some, that allowing Five. or Six Foot deep in *Church-yards* and *Burying-places*, and One Foot deep in other parts of the Earth where the Particles of Humane Bodies may be suppos'd to have been drop'd and scatter'd by the Wind, there will hardly be fit Matter enough in the whole *Surface* of the *Earth* to make up so many *Humane* Bodies as there have been, and will be, in the World.

Should

Should I shew that here in *England* alone, which is but a very small Part of the Globe of the *Earth*, if you go but *One single Foot deep*, there is as much Substance as would make up all the Bodies of Mankind that ever were, or ever will be, tho' the World should last in all 10000 Years; should I shew thus much, I suppose it would be granted that the weakness of this Objection would be sufficiently expos'd. I shall not only undertake to prove that, but I shall undertake to demonstrate that in less than the 17th Part of the Kingdom (which is much less than the biggest of our Counties) there is more than enough to do it. I demonstrate it thus:

1. It appears by the best Calculations, that there are in *England* about *Forty Millions* of *Acres*: In every *Acre* there are 43560 square Feet. There are therefore in the whole Kingdom about 1742400000000 Square Feet.

2. Its suppos'd by the most Judicious, that in all the World there may be living at one time, old and young, about *Three Hundred Millions* of People. It appears by the *Weekly Bills*, that there are born and die every Year about the *Thirtieth* Part of Mankind. Therefore *Thirty Years* must be allow'd for one

O

Age.

Age. Now if we multiply *Three Hundred Millions* by as many *Thirties* as are contain'd in 10000 Years, the whole Number of Mankind in 10000 Years will amount to but little more than 99999000000, which is not the *Seventeenth* Part of the Number of Square Feet contain'd in *England*. By allowing *three hundred millions* one Age with another, I have allow'd much more than *three hundred Millions* to be at this time living in the World. For in the first Ages of the World, and after the *Floud*, there were but very few.

3. A *solid* Foot of *common* Earth contains in it Substance more than enough to make up a *Humane* Body, Men, Women, and Children consider'd one with another. For it weighs about *Fivescore and Thirteen* Pound; whereas the weight of an ordinary *Man* is no more than *Ten Stone*, or *Sevenscore* Pound. If therefore allowance be made for the Bodies of *Women*, who generally weigh much less than *Men*, and for those of *Children* under *Sixteen* Years of Age, who are *half* the Number of Mankind (*Infants* under *Five* Years of Age, who weigh but very little, are reckon'd one *Quarter* of Mankind) I say, if we make this allowance, it will plainly appear
that

that the weight of a *Humane* Body, taking one with another, is not so great as the weight of a *Solid* Foot of common Earth. It is manifest therefore, that in less than the *Seventeenth* Part of *England*, if you go but *One Foot* deep, there is as much Substance as would make up all the *Humane* Bodies that ever were, are, and will be, tho' the World should last in all 10000 Years.

We will give the Objector leave to suppose that the World will last in all 20000 Years, and that there are in the World, one Age with another, *Six Hundred Millions* of *Humane* Bodies, yet in less than one *Quarter* of the Kingdom of *England*, there would be within a Foot of the *Surface*, more Earth than would weigh down all. I need not here put him in mind that the *Sea* has devour'd many Millions of Bodies.

It appears from what has been said, that the Resurrection of *all* the Bodies of Mankind is not *impossible*. And since it is not *impossible*, there is not any *difficulty* in it. For all things that are *possible*, are *equally easie* to an Omnipotent Agent. 'Tis an Assertion of * *Pliny's*, * *Hist. Nat.*
l. 7. c. 7. (as has been already observ'd) That *God* himself is not able to raise up a dead Man to Life. But whatever he thought of his *Gods*, and whatever were his

Notions concerning the Power of the *Deity*, there is no one now can doubt of God's Power and Sufficiency.

I need not endeavour to demonstrate that he is able to distinguish and to gather together the confus'd and scatter'd Particles of our several Bodies, howsoever blended, and work ~~in~~ with other Matter, and to range and mould 'em as they were before. I need not endeavour to demonstrate that he is able to provide that the Particles which compounded the *necessary* Parts of one Man's Body, shall never belong to the *necessary* Parts of another, or that they shall not be the Particles of another at the time of his Death. He that created all the Particles that are in the Universe, He that made all the Bodies, that ever were, out of 'em, He *in whose Book* are all our *Members*, and our Particles, *written*, how can he be ignorant to what uses each Particle has been put, and where they are all repositied? He who first created our Bodies, and form'd 'em of the *Dust* of the Earth, how can it be difficult for him to raise up the *Dust* of the *Grave*, and make it *declare his Truth*? He that first commanded *Man* to come as it were out of Nothing, what can hinder but that he should be obey'd when he shall be pleas'd to command
the

the Children of Men to come again? If so mean a Thing as a *Loadstone* can distinguish and gather together the little Particles of *Iron* that lie confus'd and undistinguish'd in the Dust; how much more shall the *Almighty Magnetism* of Him that made the *Loadstone*, be able to distinguish and raise up together the confus'd and lost Particles of our Bodies? If *Mercury*, when dead and dissolv'd, can, even by the Power of *Nature*, be reduced and restor'd to its *Life* and Being, how much more shall the great *God of Nature* be able to reduce and restore our dead and dissolved Bodies to their former State? I shall not any longer insist on these things. There is no one can doubt of the Resurrection on the account of the difficulty of it, but such as with the *Athenians* worship an *Unknown God*.

The *Third Objection* is taken from the *unworthiness* of these our Bodies, and from their *unsuitness* to be made the Habitation of the *Soul* in the next Life, which is to be in *Heaven*, and *Everlasting*. The Consideration of the *Impureness* of these our Bodies made the Heathen Philosophers *deride* and *abominate* the Doctrine of the Resurrection. To hope for the Resurrection of the

O 3

Body,

* *Ap. Orig.* Body, says * *Celsus*, becomes rather the
 1.5. p. 240. *Worms*, than *Men*: And what *Man's Soul*,
 † *Naked* says he, would ever desire to be re-united
 Gospel. to a *Body* that is already rotten? Thus
 a † late Author, to disgrace this Do-
 ctrine, is pleas'd to call the *Body* a *Load*
of Carrion, and to compare it to *course*
nasty Rags.

I shall not say, in answer to *Celsus*,
 that the Soul will ever desire to return
 to the Body purely for the Body's sake.
 Neither are we to regard what the Soul
 might perhaps desire, but what God has
 order'd to be done. Were the Soul to
wish without any regard to the Will
 and Good-pleasure of God, I am apt
 indeed to believe she would hardly de-
 sire to be re-conjoined to her Body.
 But neither would she wish to be in a-
 ny Body whatever: She would not be
 what she is, not a *Soul*, but a *Seraphim*.
 But is the *Clay* to say to the *Potter*, *Why*
dost thou make me thus? The Ambition
 of the Soul must stoop to the Pleasure
 of God. Her Wishes and Desires must
 all con-center in the Will of her Al-
 mighty Maker and Preserver. As she
 must be contented with that middle
 degree of Glory in which God has pla-
 ced her, so likewise she must be con-
 tented with that *Colleague* and *Compani-*

on which he shall think fit to assign her. When he shall be pleas'd to command her to return to her old Habitation, tho' it were as to a *Prison*, she must humbly and resignedly submit to his good Pleasure: *Behold the Handmaid of the Lord, be it unto me according to thy Word.*

But why should we imagine that the Soul, when she shall be remanded to her Body, will look upon herself as sent to a *Prison*? That *House*, which was once a *Prison*, may be turned to a *Palace*, and such a one too as the *Owner* of it would be glad to live in forever. Were the wretched and disorderly *House*, in which my Soul now lives, to continue always just such as it is, she would doubtless think herself happy in being sent for *abroad*, and, with reason, be glad to continue always *from home*. This *Flesh*, in which we now live, may at present be deservedly styl'd a *Prison*, or a *Burden*, or an *Enemy*, or whatsoever else is not *Declamation* and *Irreverence*. 'Tis our Church in her Office of *Burial* that calls it the *Burden of the Flesh*: And 'tis the Author of *Ecclesiasticus*, that tells us, that *the corruptible Flesh presseth down the Soul*. Such indeed is *our Earthly House of this Taberna-*

22
100

* Rom.
VII. 18.

bernacle, so foul, so inconvenient and ruinous, that I know not who would be very fond of it. Who is there that can say, *It is good for us to be here?* * I know that in my *Flesh*, as at present it is, *there dwelleth no good thing*. We are now in a *Body of Death*, as the *Apostle* himself calls it, and well may we desire with the *Apostle* (and with much more reason than he) to be *deliver'd from it*. But is this *Body* to be always thus *constitution'd*? Is it always to remain this *Needy* and *Impure*, this *Passionate*, *Lustful*, *Restive* *Body*? We have hitherto look'd but on one *Side* of it; let us now look upon it in the *Reverse*. *Immortal*, *Incorruptible*, *Powerful*, *Spiritual*, *Celestial*, *Glorious*! These are the *Attributes* of the *Body* that shall be rais'd. And where is now the *unworthiness* of it? Where is the *unfitness* to be made the *Habitation* of the *Soul*? Was there heretofore a *Law* in our *Members* warring against the *Law* of our *Minds*? Were there heretofore continual *Fends* between the *Flesh* and the *Spirit*? There is now a perpetual *Peace*: Their *Quarrels* and *Bickerings* are all at an end: They are now no longer *Enemies*, but loving and faithful *Friends*. It is not properly in the *Nature* of *Flesh*

to oppose it self to the *Soul*, and to revolt from its Duty and Subjection. It is *naturally* Quiet and Passive, and though in this Life the *Wheels* and *Movements* of the Noble *Machine* are sometimes disorder'd, yet in the next they will all move regularly and in obedience to the *Intelligence* that governs it. When God shall be pleas'd to raise it up out of the Grave, it will drop all its *Passions* and *Restiveness*, together with its *Impurities*, and carry up nothing with it but its Natural *Gentleness*, and a Will to be govern'd. Those *Traces*, which sensible Pleasures had imprinted on it, will be all perfectly Obliterated, and the new *Impressions* which it will receive will be truly worthy of Heaven and Eternity. Had our Bodies heretofore many Infirmities? Were they *sickly*, or *maim'd*, or *crook'd*, or *old*, or otherwise deform'd? These Infirmities and all Imperfections are now done away. The Body is *new-cast*, the *Mold* work'd better, and the *Mettal* refin'd: The whole *Figure* comes out with Vast Improvements; though the same as to all the *Ideal Rudiments*, yet a much more curious and delicate Piece of Workmanship. Whatever it was heretofore, it has now no *real* Deformity, no *Wrinkle*, or *Blemish*, but
all

all is turn'd to *Comeliness* and *Beauty*. At least we shall then have a truer Notion of *Beauty* and *Deformity*, and that which now passes for *Ugliness* will then appear to be no such thing.

Hæc est vera resurrectionis Confessio, quæ sic gloriam carni tribuit, ut non auferat veritatem. So † St. Jerom. And that *Confession* we must stand to. Now, how far these Bodies of ours are capable of being exalted and glorified, so as still to continue truly *Humane*, I shall not presume to determine. I am not fond of walking in the Dark, especially when it is to little or no purpose: But because you desire to know what my Sentiments are concerning our future State, and are pleas'd to ask me that Question, *How are the Dead rais'd up? And with what Body do they come?* I must own my-self inclin'd to believe that our Bodies in the Resurrection will be, as to their *Purity, Constitution, and Liveliness*, the same with that of *Adam* when first it came from the Hands of its Maker with the Stamps and Characters of the Divine Goodness and Wisdom fresh upon it. That was the true *Exemplar* and *Original* and *Perfection* of *Humane Nature*. All the Difference, I think, will be this, That *Adam's* Body after
some

some little Time stood in need of Meat and Drink to supply its Evacuations, and was fitted to make him the Father of Mankind ; Ours in the Resurrection will continue always the same, without *Per-spiration*, or any other Evacuation. The *Springs* will always have the same *Bent*, the *Motions* will all be equally *Regular*, the same continual *Round* of the same pure vigorous Spirits, and the same Blood moving forever in a brisk but *even* Circulation. The Apostles Epithets of *Powerful*, and *Spiritual*, and *Celestial*, and *Glorious*, and all that the Scripture says of our Transformation into the Divine likeness, I take to signifie no more, than this *even*, and *pure*, and *dispassionate*, and *incorruptible* State of the Body, with a perfect Refinement of all our Faculties. This perhaps is much less than what some others are willing to allow to a *glorified* Body : But I see no Reason why we should expect any higher Exaltation. And if such be the State and Condition of it, I know no Reason why we should desire any higher. This Heavenly Frame is enough to make us truly Happy and Blessed, no less than if our Bodies were *Ethereal*, and our Souls were carried in those fine *Celestial Chariots* which the Heathen Philosophers talk of.

If

If *Adam* had not sinn'd, these very same Bodies had then been *Immortal* and wholly exempted from Death : Why then should we think it strange that the *Immortal* Bodies which God will bestow on us in the Resurrection, should be truly *Human* ? The *Immortality* of these Bodies was then intended as a Blessing ; and shall we not think it a Blessing worthy of the Donor, to have the same Body restored to a better State than that from which it was fallen ? Yes ! This is enough, and This is all I desire, and This I hope to obtain. Let this my Body, this very same Body, be made pure, my Pollutions wash'd away, my Passions subdu'd my Wants remov'd, my Understanding clear'd, my sense of true Pleasure enliven'd, let this be but done, and my Soul will desire no more. Her *old Acquaintance*, when blessed with these happy Transmutations will be truly welcome to her. Neither She nor the *Angels* will ever be asham'd of his Company. Let this be but done, and I shall not think the grossness of it to be any Diminution of my Happiness. I shall not envy the Glory of *Incorporeal* Beings, but shall heartily thank God, that *I am what I am.*

A *Fourth* Objection is concerning the unsuitableness of a *Humane* Body to be plac'd in Heaven on account of its *Gravity*. How can a *Humane* Body, that is naturally *heavy*, be sustain'd in a pure *Ethereal* Heaven? I answer,

1. If those Regions of Heaven, where the Saints are hereafter to have their Habitation, be all *fluid* and *Ethereal*, or even *void Space*, yet our Bodies may without the least difficulty, and without any Miracle, or particular Care of Omnipotence be there supported and sustain'd. There is no such thing as *Gravity* in Regions *purely Ethereal* which are above the *Reach* and *Activity* of particular *Orbs*. There is no *High and Low* in such Places. Our Bodies will be there sustain'd, as the Globe of the Earth, and the several celestial *Orbs*, are now sustain'd in the *Air* and *Ether*. Which is not done by a *Miracle*: for they are *Naturally* sustain'd there, and there is not any Low to which they may encline. There is nothing indeed (properly speaking) *Heavy* in its own Nature, as there is not any thing *Light* in its own Nature. And our Bodies even here in this World do not of their own Natures tend towards the Center of the Earth; but they are violently *haled* or *push'd* down. Had there

(a) *Tomo* there been no *external Causes* of what
 2. p. 244. we call *Gravity* contriv'd by the Crea-
 6, 7. tor, there would have been no such
 (b) *Ap.* Thing, no *High and Low*, in the Uni-
Epiphan. verse. This no one can deny that con-
Her. 64. siderers the *System* of the World.
 c. 32.

*Tαταχθῆ-
 σιν μὲν
 τὰς τῶν κτῆ-
 ον, &c.*
Et verò 2. That the place in which we are
*percur-
 bandam
 esse crea-
 turam, ve-
 lut in illà
 conflagra-
 tione pe-
 rituram, ut
 iterùm
 creetur
 non ta-
 men ex-
 ringuen-
 dam esse,
 putandum
 est: Ut in
 instaurato
 mundo ip-
 simet in-
 staurati ac
 doloris ex-
 pertes ha-
 bitemus;*
to have our Abode in the next Life, is
 all pure *Ether*, or *Immaterial*, is perhaps
 not so true as generally suppos'd. Per-
 haps after all, our *Heaven* will be no-
 thing but a *Heaven upon Earth*, or some
 glorious solid *Orb* created on purpose
 for us in those immense Regions which we
 call *Heaven*. It seems more natural to
 suppose that since we have solid and
 material Bodies, we shall be placed, as
 we are in this Life, on some solid and
 material *Orb*. Neither is this a *new* Opi-
 nion, but embrac'd by many of the An-
 cients. That after the Resurrection we
 are to live for ever on a *new Earth*, was,
 as *Maximus* tells (a) us, the Opinion
 of many in his time. And the same was
 asserted in the *Third Century* by St. (b)

quemadmodum in 103. Psalmo proditum est. *Emitte spiritum tuum,
 & creabuntur, & removabis faciem terra.* Quod nimirum ambien-
 tem aerem temperatissimum deinceps facturus sit Deus. Cum enim
 post sæculi præsentis exitum adhuc terra perseveratura sit, habi-
 tatores in ea quosdam inesse necesse est; qui nec morituri sunt am-
 plius, neque copulandi nuptiis aut procreandæ soboli operam da-
 turi, sed Angelorum more sine ulla mutatione immortalitatis statim
 optima sint quæque facturi. Proindeque stultum est quam vitæ ra-
 tione usura sine corpora querere, si nec aer, neque terra, neque
 quicquam cæterorum sit amplius futurum.

Methodo-

Methodius, Bishop of Tyre, in his Treatise Concerning the Resurrection. (a) St. (a) Epist. Peter himself tells us that after this ^{2. c. 3.} World is dissolv'd there will be new ^{v. 15.} Heavens, and a new Earth wherein dwelleth Righteousness. He adds, that this the Saints look for; with a plain Intimation, that there they are hereafter to Inhabit. St. John also in his Revelations (b) makes mention of a new Earth, where (b) C. 21. the Blessed are to have their happy abode ^{v. 1.} after this World is destroy'd. These places the Chilists produce to confirm their Opinion; but they ought to be understood of the everlasting Habitation of the Blessed. Our Saviour tells his Disciples: (c) In my Fathers House are many Mansions: I go to prepare a place for you. And If I go to prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto my-self, that where I am, there ye may be also. In the Regions of Heaven, tho' before our Saviour's Ascension there were many Mansions of Angels or Immaterial Beings, yet those (it seems) were not thought fit for the Habitation of Men. There was no Mansion proper for Men, none sufficiently suited to their Nature, till Christ ascended up thither in his Body. He then created one proper for the reception of his own Humane Nature, and

(c) S. Joh:
XIV. 23.

and for the Habitation of our *Bodies*. This I take to be that *New Earth*, or *Habitable Orb*, which is spoken of by St. Peter and St. John. There Christ at present remains; from thence (as he says) he will come to judge this World, and the *Good* he will carry up with him, to live there for ever in unspeakable Happiness. I know that St. John seems to intimate that that *new Earth*, which he speaks of, is not in *Heaven*: For he says that the *New Jerusalem* came down on that Earth from *Heaven*. But we ought not to understand the Descriptions contain'd in the *Revelations* too strictly. By the *New Jerusalem* coming down from *Heaven* on that *new Earth*, he seems to mean only this, that in that *new Earth* the Throne of God, or his most especial Presence, will be *among Men*. I leave these things to your Consideration, and proceed to

The *Fifth* and last *Objection*, which is concerning the *uselessness* of a *Humane* Body in the next Life, and the *unnecessariness* of raising up the *same* that died. Our Adversaries perhaps are willing to grant that there is no impossibility in the Resurrection, and that the Body being purified and exalted to the highest degree of *Humane* Perfection, may

may be worthy of the Heavenly Mansions: But however, say they, it is not agreeable to the Divine Wisdom to raise up the *same Humane Body*. Why not? Why, he acts, says the *Etherealist*, in all things wisely, and for some end: But to what purpose should he raise up the *same Body*, when a *new one* will serve as well? and to what purpose should he again invest the Soul with a *Humane Body*, when the several Parts of it are *useless*?

In answer to this, its commonly acknowledged, that the *same Humane Body* must rise again, and be united to the Soul, that together with the Soul, it may be either rewarded or punish'd for the Good or Evil we did in this Life. It would be *Injustice* (they say) for God to punish or reward the *Soul* alone for what it did not *alone*, but together with the *Body*. This Argument is commonly made use of not only by the *School-men*, and other Modern Divines, but by almost all the Ancients, (a) *Athenagoras*, (b) *Tertullian*, (c) *Greg. Nazianzen*, (d) *St. Chrysostom*, the Author of the (e) *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, (f) *Epiphanius*, (g) *St. Ambrose*, (h) *Theodoret*, (i) *Æneas Gazæus*, (k) *Johannes Damascenus*, (l) *Nilus*, (m) *Photius*, and several others

(a) *De Re-
jur.* p. 261.

(b) *De Re-
Legat.* p.

39.

(c) *De Re-
jur.* c. 14,

15. & ali-
bi.

(d) *Orat. in
Cæsarium.*

(e) *Serm.*
7. in Gene-
fin.

(f) *C. 7. § 2.*

(g) *Har.*
64. c. 72.

(h) *De Re-
jur.* i

(i) *De pro-
vid. Orat.*

9. p. 432.

3. tom. 4ti.

(j) *Theo-
phrasia*, p.

66.

(k) *De Or-
ibod. Fide,*

c. ult.

(l) *Hamil.*
1. in Pas-
cha ap.

(m) *Epist.*
de Synodis,

p. 12.

thers of the ancient *Greeks* and *Latins*. They all agree, that God is obliged in *Justice* to reward or punish the *Body* together with the *Soul*. The same is asserted in one place (which I have produced) by *Origen* himself. And this is the reason assigned for the Resurrection by the *Talmudists* in the Tract (n) *Sanhedrin*.

(n) P. 311,
317. Edit.
Coc.

I desire as much as any Man to pay a just Deference and Regard to the Judgments of the ancient Fathers: But it must be confess'd, that tho' their Authority be great in Matters of *Tradition*, yet the *Reasons* and *Arguments* which they produce to confirm their Doctrines, are not always convincing. If we seriously and impartially consider this Assertion, we shall find it not to be true. My reasons, in short, are these. *First*, To speak properly, the *Body* is not capable either of *sinning*, or *doing well*. It is only the *Instrument* of the *Soul*. And the *Arm* that *stabs*, sins no more than the *Sword*. 'Tis the *Soul* only that is the *Murderer*. Neither, *Secondly*, is the *Body* capable of any Reward or Punishment. 'Tis the *Soul* only that is *sensible*, and nothing but what is *sensible* can be capable of Rewards and Punishments. *Thirdly*, If it be Injustice in God
to

to punish the Soul alone without the Body in conjunction with which she committed the Sin, then all the Matter which constituted the Body when the several Sins were committed, must be rais'd again, and be re-united to the Soul. For if some, why not all? But what *Monsters of Men* should we be in the *Resurrection*, if all the Substance of which our Bodies consisted from our *Childhood* to our *Deaths*, should be gather'd together and form'd into a Body.

'Twas the Opinion of some of the ancient Hereticks, That the Souls of Men Die, and are *dissolv'd* together with the Body, and *revive* and *rise* again with it in the *Resurrection*. Which Opinion supposes the Soul to be *material* as well as the Body, which many of the ancient Christians, who were not look'd upon as *Heretical*, believ'd. Eusebius (a) tells ^{a H. A. VI.} us of certain Christians of *Arabia*, in the ^{37.} Third Century, who advanc'd and taught this Opinion concerning the Soul's *Dissolution* and *Resurrection*, and that it was condemn'd by a Synod there call'd on purpose, in which * *Origen* was pre-

^{* Eusebius intimates}
that it was the *sensus* Origen, and so it is commonly taken for granted. But the Author of the Synodicon, c. 18. seems to intimate that he was one of the Arabian Bishops; Συνοδος ἀναθεσιβειῶν καὶ Ἀραβίων, καὶ ἱερέων ἐκκλησιῶν ἀναθεσιβειῶν.

sent, by whom, he says, they that maintain'd it were *re-converted*. *Gilbertus Gaulminus* *, in his Notes on the Book *De vitâ & morte Moſis*, ſays, that the *Arabick* Hiſtorians aſcribe this Opinion, that the Soul *dies* together with the Body, to *Origen* himſelf. But that *Origen* did not hold that Opinion appears very evidently from a Hundred places in his Works. *Tatianus*, who was Scholar to *Juſtin M.* and lived before theſe times, tho' he held that the Souls of the *Good* do not die together with the Body, yet he † aſſerts that thoſe of the *Wicked* do, and that being *dissolv'd*, they are *rais'd up* again, together with the Body, in the Day of Judgment.

There were others who maintain'd, that the *Soul*, tho' it does not properly *die* together with the *Body*, yet after its ſeparation from the Body it *ſleeps* as it were, and remains altogether *inſenſible*: That it is not capable of any *perception* without the concurrence of an *Organical* Body. Theſe are call'd *Psychopannychites*.

* *Vide ejus Opera*, to. 2. p. 243, St. *Maximus* * ſpeaks of this as a prevailing Opinion in his time, which was about the middle of the Seventh Century.

* He only held that We are told by ſome (but I think * the Soul does not at all enjoy the *Beatifick Viſion* before the *Reſurrection*: which was indeed the general Opinion of the *Primitive Fathers*.

untruly)

* L. 1.
c. 12.

† *Orat. c.*
Græc. p.
152.

untruly) that P. John XXII. maintain'd it. *Stephanus Gobarus* * speaks of some ^{* Ap. Ph. iii Bibl. p. 898.} who maintain'd, that the *Soul never leaves the Body, but remains always in it, and is buried together with it*, and is raised up with it in the Resurrection. Whether these maintain'd that it properly *dies*, and is *dissolv'd*, or that it only remains *insensible*, he does not say. *Tertullian* himself, tho' in † other places he asserts † *De Anima*, c. 58. the *sensibility* of *separated Souls*, and that ^{Omnes ergo animæ penes inferos? inquis. Velis ac nolis, & supplicia} of it-self it is capable of Rewards and Punishments, and is actually in some measure *rewarded* or *tormented* before the *Resurrection*; yet in his *Apology* a-

jam illic, & refrigeria. — Cur enim non putes, animam & puniri & foveri in inferis interim sub expectatione utriusque judicii, in quadam usurpatione & candida ejus? Quia salvum debet esse, inquis, in judicio divino negotium suum, sine ullâ prælibatione sententiæ, tum quia & carnis operienda est restitutio, ut consortis operarum atque mercedum. Quid ergo fiet in tempore isto? dormiemus? At enim animæ nec in viventibus dormiunt. Corporum enim est somnus, quorum & ipsa mors cum speculo suo somno. — Semper autem expectat anima corpus, ut doleat, aut gaudeat? nonne & de suo sufficit sibi ad utrumque titulum passionis? — Novit & apud inferos anima & dolere & gaudere sine carne; quia & in carne illæsi, si velit, dolet, & læsa, si velit, gaudet. Hoc si ex arbitrio suo in vitâ, quanto magis ex judicio Dei post mortem, &c.

De Resur. Carnis, c. 17. Simplicior quisque fautor sententiæ nostræ, putabit, carnem etiam idcirco repræsentandam esse judicio, quia aliter anima non capiat passionem tormenti seu refrigerii, utpote incorporalis: Hoc enim vulgus existimat. Nos autem animam corporalem & hic profitemur, & in suo volumine probamus, habentem proprium genus substantiæ, soliditatis, per quam quid & sentite & pati possit. Nam & nunc animas torqueri, foverique penes inferos, licet nudas, licet adhuc exules carnis, probavit Lazari exemplum, &c.

(a) Certè
quia ratio
restitutio-
nis desti-
natio judi-
cii est, ne-
cessario
idem ipse
qui fuerat
exhibe-
bitur, ut
boni seu
contrarii
meriti ju-
diciu à Deo referat. Ideoq; repræsentabuntur & corpora. Quia
neq; pati quicquam potest anima sola sine materiâ stabili, id est, car-
ne, c. 48.

(b) C. 4. Affirmamus te manere post vitæ dispositionem, & expectare diem judicii, proq; meritis aut cruciatui destinari, aut refrigerio, utroq; sempiterno. Quibus sustinendis necessario tibi substantiam pristinam, ejusdemq; hominis materiam & memoriam reversoram, quod & nihil mali ac boni sentire possis sine carnis passionalis facultate.

gainst the *Heathens*, he expressly affirms that (a) the Soul is not capable of suffering at all, but in union with the *Flesh*, and that that is one Reason why the *Flesh* is to rise. Again in his Book (b) *de Testimonio Animæ*: To enjoy everlasting Happiness, or to sustain everlasting Torments, it is necessary that thou shouldst be restored to thy former Substance, because thou art not capable of feeling either Pleasure or Pain without *Flesh*.

If this Opinion were true, That the Soul is not capable in its own nature, without an *organiz'd* Body, of any Perception, (I take no notice here of that other Opinion concerning the *death* and *dissolution* of the Soul) we should not need to look any further for a reason why God has ordained that the Soul should be again united to a *Humane* Body; since it would not otherwise be capable after death of being either *Rewarded* or *Punish- ed*. And it must be confess'd that this Notion is very consistent with the Do-
ctrine

ctrine of the *Resurrection*, and the general *Judgment*, which is to follow the *Resurrection*. But here lies the difficulty: I know not how to make it consistent with some other Places of the Scripture. The Scripture is plainly against it. When our Saviour tells the penitent Thief upon the Cross, *This day thou shalt be with me in Paradise*, He seems to intimate that he should be *sensible* of that happiness. That Wish of St. Paul in the 1st of the *Philip*. That he might *depart and be with Christ*, seems yet more clear and convincing. The Apostle seems plainly to intimate, that *being with Christ*, he should be *sensible* of it. That St. Paul believed that the Soul after its Separation from the Body remains *sensible*, and is capable of *perceiving* without any *Organs* of Sense, I infer more over from that Place where he speaks of his being rapt up into Heaven, which others (I think) do not usually take notice of. He says that *he could not tell*, whether he was rapt up into Heaven, and saw there those unspeakable Sights in the Body or out of the Body. Now he could not have doubted of that, if he had not believed that the Soul is *sensible* when *out of the Body*. To this we may add that Place of St. John in the *Revelations*, where he says (a) that he saw in Hea-

ven The Souls of them that were slain for the Word of God, and they cried with a loud Voice, saying, How long, O Lord, &c. There are other places in that Book which confirm the same thing.

Tertullian in his Book *De Resurrectione Carnis*, where he owns that separated Souls do not Sleep, but are sensible, and are actually punish'd or rewarded before the Resurrection, says (a) they are punish'd or rewarded before the Resurrection for those good or bad things which they did without the concurrence of the Body, as for good or bad Thoughts, Desires, and Contrivances; and he seems to intimate that tho' the Soul is in its own nature capable of Rewards and Punishments, yet it is not in its own nature (b) so capable as when it is united to the Body. It is capable, he says, of greater Pleasure or Torment when united to the Body, than when in a State of Separation, and therefore for those things which she actually did in concurrence with the Body, she

(b) Porro si hæc cogitatus, concupiscentia, voluntas) satis essent ad plenitudinem meritorum, ut

non requirerentur & facta, sufficeret in totum anima ad perfectionem judicii; de his judicanda, in quæ agenda sola suffecerat. Quum verò etiam facta devincta sint meritis; facta autem per carnem administrantur; jam non sufficit animam sine carne soteri; sive cruciari, pro operibus etiam carnis, etsi habet corpus, etsi habet membra; quæ proinde illi non sufficiunt ad sentiendum plene, quemadmodum nec ad agendum perfecte. Denique, hæc erit ratio in ultimum finem destinati judicii, ut exhibitione carnis omnis divina censura perfici possit.

must

must be punished or rewarded in the Body, that the Pleasure or Torment may be perfect. But this is very precarious; and if once it be granted that the Soul is in its own nature, without an organiz'd Body, capable of Rewards and Punishments, it cannot be denied but that it is of its self capable of being *fully* rewarded or punished.

We have not yet found out a Reason for this Decree of God Almighty concerning the *Resurrection*: If we would give a true account of it, it is necessary we should mount a little higher, and look a little farther. I shall pass by many Conjectures which we find in the Schools, and in some of our ancient Writers, and among the Jewish *(a)* Masters, and shall lay before you my own Thoughts.

*(a) Vide
Menasseh
Ben Israel*

de Resur. l. 2. c. 19, 20, 21, 22.

Quare futura est sexus differentia in altera vitâ, rationem vide assignatam ap. Quæst. a d *Orthod.* inter Opera S. Justinii M. p. 4. B. 3.

If it be not Presumption to take upon one to search into God's *Counsels*, and the Reasons of his *Decrees*, I should think that one Reason why he has been pleas'd to decree that the Soul in the Day of Judgment shall be again united to a *Humane* Body, may be this; That as we are *Men* when we *sin* or *do well*, so we may be *Men* when by

(a) Cor.
c. 5. v. 10.

a judicial Sentence we are punish'd or rewarded for it. But we cannot be *Men* unless we have *Humane Bodies*. St. Paul (a) tells us, that we must all appear before the Judgment-Seat of Christ, that every Man may receive the Things done in the Body, according to that he hath done whether it be good or bad. And as we are to give an account for what we did in the Body, so in the Body we shall give an account. If it be reasonable that we should be *Men* when we are punish'd or rewarded for what we did when *Men*; it seems much more reasonable that we should be then the same *Men*: But we cannot be the same *Men* unless we have the same *Bodies*. 'Tis a great Mistake to imagine that the *Identity* or *Sameness* of a *Man* consists wholly in the *sameness* of the *Soul*. If *Euphorbus*, and *Homer*, and *Ennius*, had had one and the same *Soul*, yet they would not have been one and the same, but Three distinct *Men*. In what the *Identity* or *sameness* of the *Body* consists, that That of the *Rising Body* can consist in nothing else but in the Restoration of the same Numerical Particles, which made up the dissolved Body, to their former Construction, I have already told you.

Another

Another Reason why God has been pleas'd to ordain that the *same Humane* Body that died shall rise again and be reconjoin'd to the Soul, I take to be this: (and this indeed I take to be the First and the Chief Reason of that Decree.) We had all been *Immortal Men*, if *Adam* had not sinn'd; 'twas God's design that we should never die, but that our Souls should remain for ever united to their Bodies. This gracious Design being frustrated by *Adam's* Transgression, he was graciously pleas'd to ordain, that as in *Adam* all die, so by the Merits of Christ, the *second Adam*, we should all at last triumph over Death, and be restored to those *Bodies*, and that *Humane Nature* which he first design'd should be *Immortal*. By the Death and Resurrection of Christ our Losses are to be repair'd which *Adam's* sinning occasion'd; but our Losses cannot be repair'd unless we are restor'd to those Bodies which by his sinning we lost.

Will neither of these Reasons satisfy the *Etherealist*? Well, then I will give him another. I will give him a most certain Reason why God will restore us to our *Humane Natures*, and why

why he will raise up the very same Body. *He will because he will.* A very bad Reason to be given for the Actions of *Man*, but a very good one for *God's* ! He will because he hath promis'd. *I am the Lord, and I have said it* (says he) and *who can say, What doest thou ?* There is nothing, that God does, but He does for a very good Reason : But who are We, that we should call him to an Account for what he does ? His ways and his Counsels are many of
 (a) 33.13. 'em *unsearchable* to us, and as (a) *Job* tells us, *he giveth not account of any of his Matters.* 'Tis his part to act, ours to admire and submit, and as long as our *Reason* and our *Senses* are not plainly contradicted, we are only to enquire *What*, not *How*, or *Why* ?

I would fain know of those who deny the Resurrection of the same *Humane* Body, because they do not know what use we can have of the particular Parts of such a Body in the life to come, whether they deny or doubt of the Existence of all other things, the Reason of which they cannot comprehend ? I should undertake to quiet all the Scruples of those Men, and to satisfy all their *Queries*, if they would be but pleas'd to undertake to answer a few
 Questi-

Questions of mine. I could ask 'em the Reason of a hundred Things both in *Nature* and *Divinity*, but to bring my Questions home to the Case before us; If they will not believe that in the Life to come we shall have *Humane* Bodies, because they cannot see to what uses our several Parts can then serve, let 'em tell me to what *real* Uses all the Parts of our Bodies serve here in this Life. By that time they are able to do that, I believe I may be able to assign them the uses of the several Parts of our Bodies in the Life to come. If they please to cast their Eyes down on their own Bodies, they may there see certain Parts of which there is no *real* Use; such as were bestowed on their Bodies for *Resemblance* Sake only. Why therefore might not God give us *Humane* Bodies in the next Life, meerly for this Reason (Suppose, if you please that there is no other) that they that *Rise* may *Resemble* or *be like* those that Died, or *be such* as they were? I would ask the *Etherealist* a Question or two more. Let him tell me for what Reason God gave us a *Body* here in *this* Life, why he made us *Corporeal* Beings, since only to have created so many *Souls* or *Spirits*, might have conduced as much,

or

or, for ought we can see, more, to His Glory, and our Happiness, than to make us, as he has done, of *Body and Soul*. Let him tell me for what Reason we shall have in the Life to come any Body at all (as he himself grants we shall have an *Ethereal* one) since the *Soul* is in its own Nature, and without any sort of *Body*, Capable of Rewards and Punishments? In a Word, the same Reason God had for making us what we are, the same he will have for making us what we shall be, *viz.* His good Pleasure.——*How readest thou?*—— Go, learn to be modest. Enquire first what God has promis'd, then judge of his *Wisdom* by his Promises.

I fantasie my-self talking (*Philalethes*) to a bold Refiner on the Promises and Decrees of God Almighty, one of those little ~~Notings~~ *Notings* that call themselves Philosophers, who first form to themselves Notions and Idea's, then deal with *Revelation* as the *Tyrant* did with the poor *Innocents* on his *Bed*, either violently stretch it beyond its natural Reach, or chop off a Part to make it commensurate to their Inventions. This (I know) is what *You* are not guilty of. *You* pursue

sue the quite contrary Method. As a real *Lover of Truth*, and as becomes a true *Christian Philosopher*, you first search the Scriptures, and then the *Traditions* of the *Primitive Church*, and on these agreeing together, as on a sure and certain Foundation, you raise and build the *System* of your *Belief*. Those Doctrines which you find clearly reveal'd, you do not endeavour to puzzle with nice Objections and Scruples, nor pervert with any private *Glosses* and *Conceits* of your own: But as you find 'em so you embrace 'em. You firmly believe, and humbly acquiesce, and leave the *Contrivance* and the *Reasons* to God. Concerning the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the *same Humane Body*, which, in Obedience to your Commands, I have endeavour'd to confirm and establish, I shall here, for the close of all, add, That among all the Doctrines of *Christianity* (you understand me of such as are grounded *only* on *Revelation*) there is not any one either more plainly deliver'd in Scripture, or more clearly convey'd down to us by the Traditions of the *Primitive Fathers*, or more universally receiv'd by the *Catholick Church*, than this is. 'Tis indeed so clearly deliver'd down to us and so uni-
ver-

versally receiv'd, that to deny it, and yet at the same time profess the *Christian Faith*, seems to imply a *Contradiction*. He that would preach the one must likewise maintain the other. We must do as *St. Paul* did at *Athens* : Preach *Jesus*, and not only *the* but *This Resurrection*.

FINIS.

